This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

A

TREATISE

ON

ATONEMENT;

IN WHICH

THE FINITE NATURE OF SIN IS ARGUED,
ITS CAUSE AND CONSEQUENCES AS SUCH;
THE NECESSITY AND NATURE OF ATONEMENT;
AND ITS GLORIOUS CONSEQUENCES,

IN THE

INAL RECONCILIATION OF ALL MEN

TO HOLINESS AND HAPPINESS.

BY HOSEA BALLOU,
ator of the Second Universalist Church and Society in Boston,
"Author of Notes and Illustrations on the Parables,"
"Candid Review, &c."

---

r as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." St. Paul.
d there shall be no more death." St. John.

THIRD EDITION;
which is Prefixed a letter of the Author further declarative of his views upon the same subject.

HALLOWELL: C. SPAULDING.

1828.

OX
9941
.B4
1828
cop. 1

DISTRICT OF MAINE, ss.

L. S. BE it remembered, that on this fifth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty two, and the forty sixth year of the Independence of the United States of America, W. F. LAINE, of the District of Maine, has deposited in this Office, the title of a Book, the right whereof he claims as Proprietor, in the words following, viz :—"A Treatise on Atonement ; in which the finite nature of sin "is argued ; its cause and consequences as such ; the necessity and "nature of Atonement ; and its glorious consequences, in the Final "Reconciliation of all men to Holiness and Happiness. By HOSEA "BALLOU ; author of "Notes and Illustrations on the Parables," "Candid Review, &c."

"'For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made "alive.' St. Paul.

"'And there shall be no more death.' St. John."

In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, "An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned ;" and also, to an act, entitled, "An Act supplementary to an act, entitled, an act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned, and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints."

JOHN MUSSEY, JUN. *Clerk of the District Court of Maine.*

A true copy as of Record.

Attest, JOHN MUSSEY, JUN. *Clerk D. C. M.*

A LETTER TO THE READER.

Christian Reader,

I KNOW it is frequently the case, when a person takes a new work in hand, he first casts his eye over the title page, and if he find no word on it that indicates perverse sentiments; and the name or denomination of the author be agreeable, he may think of having patience to read it; but, being something in a hurry, passes slightly over the preface, supposing it to be of little consequence. But what sensations may have struck your mind, on reading the title of this book, and finding it to be the intention of the author to prove the doctrine of *universal holiness* and *happiness*, through the mediation and power of atoning grace, I cannot say; however, I would invite you to read, with candor and attention, not only this letter, but the whole of the work, and make up your judgment afterwards.

Many circumstances might be mentioned, which, in their association, have induced me to write and publish the following treatise; but I can say, with propriety, that the central object was that, in which I always find the most happiness, viz. to do what I find most necessary, in order to render myself most useful to mankind.

I have, from my early youth, been much in the habit of inquiring into the things of religion, and religious sentiments; and have, for a number of years, seen or thought I saw, great inconsistencies, in what has, for a long time, passed for orthodoxy in divinity.

The ideas, that sin is infinite, and that it deserves an infinite punishment; that the law transgressed is infinite, and inflicts an infinite penalty; and that the great Jehovah took on himself a natural body of flesh and blood, and actually suffered death on a cross, to satisfy his infinite justice, and thereby save his creatures from endless misery, are ideas which appear to me to be unfounded in the nature of reason, and unsupported by divine revelation. Such notions have, in my opinion, served to darken the human understanding and obscure the gospel of eternal life; and have rendered, what I esteem as divine revelation, a subject of discredit to thousands, who, I believe, would never have condemned the scriptures, had it not been for those gross absurdities being contended for, and the scriptures forced to bend to such significations. Christian authors and preachers have labored much to dissuade those whom they have caused to disbelieve the Christian religion, from their infidelity. But, in this case, the *salt* has lost its savor, become good for nothing, and is trodden under foot of men, who are *too sensible* to believe the unreasonable dogmas imposed on the world, either through error, or design, and sanctioned by tradition: and *too inattentive* to search the scriptures faithfully and impartially, whereby they might have learned that those errors were neither in them, nor supported by them. One particular object, therefore, in this work, is, if possible, to free the scripture doctrine of atonement from those incumbrances which have done it so much injury; and open a door at least, for the subject to be investigated on reasonable grounds, and by fair argument.

If we admit that our Creator made us reasonable beings, we ought, of course, to believe, that all the

truth which is necessary for our belief, is not only reasonable, but reducible to our understandings.

In order to come at the subject of atonement, so as to have light continually shining along the path which I intend to occupy, I found it necessary to show my reasons for not admitting the doctrine, on the ground on which it is usually argued: to do which, I found I must, of necessity, show, that the common notion of the *infinity* of *sin* is unfounded in truth; and of course, every consequence deducible from such an error, equally unfounded and unsupported. It may seem not a little strange, to some of my readers, that I dispute the *infinity* of the law against which sin is committed; as all unholiness must be, either in union or disunion, with the eternal law of holiness and divine purity. But if the reader will take a little pains to observe particularly, it will appear plain, that no being can stand amenable to a law above his capacity. And as the creature is *finite*, in his earthly character, in which character only, he is, or can be a sinner, it is not reasonable to say, that he stands amenable to an infinite law. But, as the reader will find, in this work so much of the divine law of perfection, as the creature obtains a knowledge of, (which, in comparisou to the whole, is no more than a shadow to a substance) is the law which he violates by his sin. And though we may speak of the sin of ignorance, it can amount to no more than the production of a virtuous intention thwarted by ignorance, or the same principle by which the beasts of the field, the fowls of the air, and the fish of the sea, gratify their various inclinations and appetites. And I do not think my reader will wish to have me prove that such sin is not infinite.

In my argument on the cause, or origin of sin, I thought it necessary to hint a little on the general idea of the subject, endeavoring to show the want of propriety in what is commonly contended for; and I have sought for the rise of unholy temptations in the constitutions of earthly and finite beings. I have endeavored, also to trace the causes and consequences of sin (as sin) so as to determine the *finite* nature of *all* which belongs to sin as *cause* and *consequence*. In any sense, in which it can be said that God is the *author* of *any thing whatever*, in that sense of speaking, *it cannot be sin*. And in any sense, in which any action, or event, can be said to be *endless*, in its *consequences*, God *must be considered* the *author* of it.

In all the statements which I have made of the doctrinal ideas of others, I have been careful to state no more than what I have read in authors, or heard contended for in preaching, or conversation; and if I have, in any instance, done those ideas any injustice, it was not intended. The reason why I have not quoted any author, or spoken of any denomination, is, I have not felt it to be my duty nor inclination, to write against any name, or denomination in the world; but my object has been, what I pray it ever may be, to contend against error, wherever I find it; and to receive truth, and support it, let it come from what quarter it may. For the sake of ease, however, in writing, I reasoned with my *opponent*, *opposer*, or *objector*, meaning no one in particular, but any one who uses the arguments, and states the objections, which I have endeavored to answer. It is very probable, that some may think me too ironical, and, in many instances, too severe, on what I call error. But I find it very difficult to expose error, so as to be un-

rstood by all, without carrying, in many instan-
s, my arguments in such a form as may not be
reeable to those who believe in what I wish to
rrect. I confess I should have been glad to have
ritten, on all my inquiries, so as not to have dis-
eased any, but to have pleased all, could I have
ne it, and accomplished my main design; but
is I was persuaded would be difficult. I have,
erefore paid particular attention to nothing but
y main object; depending on the goodness of my
ıder to pardon what may be disagreeable, in
ınner or form, as inadvertencies.

What I have written on the subject of the *Trin-*
, is mainly to show the reader in what light I
ıw the Mediator, that my general ideas of atone-
ınt may be the easier understood. And though
hink my objections and arguments, against the
ımon idea of three distinct persons in the God-
ıd, who are *equal* in *power* and *glory*, to be un-
ıwerable; yet it was not my intention to attend
a full refutation of those ideas, as I think that
ı frequently been done, and well done.

The opposers of universalism have generally
itten and contended against the doctrine, under
ntire mistaken notion of it. They have en-
vored to show the absurdity of believing that
could be received into the *kingdom* of *glory*
ighteousness, in their sins; which *no Univer-*
ever believed. In this work, I have endeav-
to make as fair a statement, of what I call
salism, as I was able; and it stands on such
d, that the *propriety* of it can no more be dis-
, than the *propriety* of *universal holinéss* and
iliation to *God.* Perhaps the reader will
has read a number of authors on the doc-
niversalism, and finds considerable differ-
their *systems.* That I acknowledge is

The scripture speaks of the *times* of the *restitution* of *all things*, but does not inform us their number, or their duration. It also speaks of the *fulness* of *times*, but gives us no date, or duration of them.

I have not stated so many objections against the doctrine which I have labored to prove, as many of my readers may wish I had, nor so many as I should have been glad to, was it not for swelling the work to more of an expensive size. But I have stated, and endeavored to answer the most frequent objections, and those on which my opposers put the most dependence; and I should have taken great satisfaction in communicating many more arguments, both from reason and scripture, in favor of universal holiness and happiness, than I have, was it not for the reason assigned in the other case. However, if those objections which I have taken notice of, are answered to the reader's satisfaction, other scriptures, generally used as argument against the salvation of all men, will not be hard to be understood, as not unfavorable to the doctrine. And as for the proofs which I have deduced from scripture and reason, I believe them entirely conclusive; but if not, more of the same kind would not be.

The reason I have not particularly explained those parables of the New Testament which I have had occasion to notice, in this work, is, my Notes, of which, mention is made on the title page of this book, are before the public, and contain my ideas on most of the parables spoken by Christ.

A question may be asked by many, which has labored much in my mind, respecting the propriety of publishing books on divinity, when we profess to believe in the book called the *Bible*, that it contains all which we mean to communicate as truth, in matters of religion; on which question I am determin-

ed for myself, that the gospel of Jesus Christ would have been better understood, had the Bible been the only book ever read on the subject. And though I doubt not but many authors have done great justice to those subjects on which they have written, and the light of the scriptures have, by such means, been caused to shine; yet, by others, it has been greatly obscured. And had one half the attention been paid to the *Bible* which has been paid to those authors who have written upon it, it would, in my opinion, have been incomparably better for Christendom. But, on account of errors imbibed, in consequence of erroneous annotations, it may be argued, that it is now necessary to write and publish correct sentiments, by the same parity of reasoning as we argue the necessity of those means to restore health, which are not necessary to continue it.

To the short exhortation, with which the believer in universalism will meet, in this work, he is humbly invited to pay strict attention; as no faith, however true it may be, can be of any real service to the believer, unless it be accompanied with the spirit and life of that truth in which it is grounded. The greater the beauty of a person, the more lamentable his death. The more divinity there is in any faith, the greater is the pity it should not be alive. "As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also."

My brethren in the ministry will not think it assuming, that I have spoken of the necessity of our paying strict attention to the stewardship into which God by his grace hath put us; as it was not written so much to instruct, as to show the brethren my faith; that they may see the ground on which I stand; know the manner in which I contend for the faith once delivered to the saints; and feel for

me the same fellowship which I feel for them. You may regret that my ideas were not more correct, in many instances, and think the great subject on which I have written, might have obtained better justice from some more experienced writer; in which you have the same ideas with myself. But in this you may be satisfied, that I have written as I now think and believe, without leaning to the right, or to the left, to please or displease. I have been often solicited to write and publish my general ideas on the gospel, but have commonly observed to my friends, that it might be attended with disagreeable consequences, as it is impossible to determine whether the ideas which we entertain at the present time are agreeable to those which we shall be under the necessity of adopting after we have had more experience; and knowing to my satisfaction, that authors are very liable to feel such an attachment to sentiments which they have openly avowed to the world, that their prejudice frequently obstructs their further acquisitions in the knowledge of the truth; and even in cases of conviction, their own self-importance will keep them from acknowledging their mistakes: And having some knowledge of my own infirmities, I felt the necessity of precaution, which I have no reason to believe, is, or has been injurious.

I have had, for some time, an intention to write a treatise on this subject, but thought of deferring it until more experience might enable me to perform it better, and leisure give me opportunity to be more particular. But the consideration of the uncertainty of life was one great stimulus to my undertaking it at this time, added to a possibility of living to be informed with what success it meets in the world, and of having an opportunity to correct whatever I might, in my future studies, find incorrect, were *not the smallest* causes of my undertaking it.

It has often been said, by the enemies of the doctrine for which I have contended, that it would do to live by, but not to die by; meaning that it would not give the mind satisfaction, when sensible it was about to leave a mortal, for an immortal state. As to the truth of the assertion, I cannot positively say, that moment has not yet been experience by me; and as those who make the remark have never believed the doctrine, I cannot see how they should know any better than I do. Thus much I can say, I believe I have seen, and often heard of persons rejoicing in the doctrine, in the last hours of their lives; but I do not build my faith on such grounds. The sorrows, or the joys of persons, in their last moments, prove nothing to me of the truth of their general belief. A Jew, who despises the name of Christ, from the force of his education, may be filled with comfortable hopes, in his last moments, from the force of the same education. I have no doubt but a person may believe, or pretend to believe, in the doctrine of universal salvation, when he knows of no solid reason for his belief, but has rather rested the matter on the judgment of those in whom he has placed more confidence, than he has in reality, on the Saviour of the world; and I think it very possible, that such Universalists may have strange and unexpected fears, when the near approach of death, or any other circumstance, should cause them to think more seriously, on so weighty a subject.

There must be a time, with all men, whose faith and confidence are placed in any thing short of divine mercy, that will be extremely trying; and all the education in the world cannot prevent it.

What my feelings might be, concerning the doctrine which I believe, was I called to contemplate

it on a *death bed,* I am as unable to say, as I am what I may think of it a year hence, should I *live* and be in *health.* But I am satisfied, beyond a doubt, that if I live a year longer, and then find cause to give up my present belief, that I shall not feel a consciousness of having professed what I did not *sincerely believe;* and was I called to leave the world and my *writings* in it, and at the *last hour* of my *life* should find I had *erred,* yet I am satisfied, that I should *possess* the *approbation* of a *good conscience* in *all* I have *written.*

Therefore, though sensible of my imperfections, yet enjoying great consolation in believing the doctrine for which I have argued, in the following work, and in the enjoyment of a good conscience, I submit the following pages to a generous and candid public, praying for the *blessing* of the God whom I *serve,* on the *feeble endeavors* of the *most unworthy whom* he hath *called* as a *servant* of *all men.*

THE AUTHOR.

A

LETTER FROM THE AUTHOR

TO THE

Publisher of the Present Edition.

BOSTON, JANUARY 2, 1827.

DEAR SIR:

In reply to yours of the 23d ult. I will say, that I am glad that another edition of the Treatise on Atonement is to be given to the public, though I regret that I could not have an opportunity to give the work a general revision.

I do not wish, by any means, to retract any of the general or leading sentiments, which are maintained in that work, although more than twenty years have elapsed since I wrote it and first sent it abroad in the world. But there are some minor ideas, and some particular applications of certain passages of scripture, which, undoubtedly, would receive some modifications were I to revise the whole.

Though I remain entirely satisfied, that, according to the theme of divine revelation, the whole

race of man is destined to a state of immortality which state will partake of perfect holiness an happiness, I am not certain that I have not, in m Treatise, indicated something in relation to man' first creation, previous to his formation, which i not clearly supported by scripture. And yet I a not able fully to account for the following readin unless something like what I have suggested b true. See Gen. ii. 4, 5, 6, 7. "These are th generations of the heavens, and of the earth, whe they were created; in the day that the Lord Go made the earth and the heavens, and every plan of the field, before it was in the earth, and ever herb of the field, before it grew: for the Lord Go had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and ther was not a man to till the ground. But there wen up a mist from the earth, and watered the whol face of the ground. And the Lord God forme man of the dust of the ground, and breathed int his nostrils the breath of life; and man became living soul." It seems that every plant and ever herb, as well as man, were created before the grew, or appeared in form as now beheld.

What I have alluded to in the Treatise is foun on the 35th page.

On page 123, I say, "It is plain to me, fro scripture, that the Mediator is the first human so which was created, &c." These passages whic I understood to favor this opinion, I now belie have reference to the new creation or new order things brought about by the gospel dispensatio It is, however, to be understood, that I now fully believe in the entire dependence of Christ God, as when I wrote the Treatise.

When I wrote this work on Atonement I w *strongly* inclined to believe that the scriptures

not teach that either sin or its punishment would exist in man's future state, but my conviction of that fact was then by no means so strong as it now is. I mention this as a reason why the reader finds, in several passages of this book, expressions which seem to allow that sin and its corresponding miseries may exist out of a state of flesh and blood.

I wish furthermore to observe, that I am now apprehensive, that in the use of some passages which speak of *fire*, I may have applied them to the *refining* and *purifying* of men, in cases wherein their proper use applied to the destruction of the Jews, and to the sufferings which the Saviour foretold would come on that people.

A

TREATISE

ON

ATONEMENT.

IN this Treatise on Atonement, I shall confine myself to three general inquiries. 1st. Of Sin, 2d. Of *Atonement* for Sin. 3d. Of the *Consequences* of *Atonement* to *Mankind*. These particulars may be represented by a *disorder*; the *remedy* for the *disorder*, and the *health* enjoyed in consequence of a *cure*.

And 1st. Of sin, which for the sake of ease, I subdivided as follows. 1. Its *nature*. 2. Its *cause*. And 3. Its *effects*.

And first of the *nature* of sin. Sin is the violation of a law which exists in the mind, which law is the imperfect knowledge men have of moral good. This law is transgressed, whenever, by the influence of temptation, a good understanding yields to a contrary choice. Where a law exists, it presupposes a legislature whose intention, in legislation must be *thwarted*, in order for the law to take cognizance of sin. This legislature, in all moral accountable beings, is a capacity to understand, connected with

the causes and means of knowledge, which standing or existing, on finite and limited principles will justify my supposition, that sin, in its nature, ought to be considered finite and limited, rather than infinite and unlimited, as has, by many, been supposed.

By offering my reasons against the infinity of sin, I shall open to an easy method of showing it to be finite. The supposition that sin is infinite, is supported, or rather pretended to be supported, on the consideration of its being committed against an *infinite law*, which is produced by an *infinite legislature*, who is God *himself*. I have before observed, and I think justly, that the intention of a legislature, in legislation, must be *thwarted*, in order for the law, to take *cognizance* of *sin*. Now if God, in a direct sense of speaking, be the legislator of the law which is *thwarted* by *transgression*, in the same direct sense of speaking, his *intentions* in *legislation* are *thwarted*. With eyes open, the reader cannot but see, that if sin be infinite because it is committed against an infinite law, whose author is God, the design of Deity must be *abortive*; to suppose which, brings a cloud of darkness over the mind, as *intense* as the supposition is *erroneous*. It cannot with any propriety be supposed, that any rational being can have an intention contrary to the knowledge which he possesses. Was a resolve brought into the State Legislature to be passed into an act, it would be very unlikely to succeed, providing the legislature knew that the intention of the act would utterly fail. It is possible, and very frequently the case, that *imperfect* beings desire contrary to their knowledge; but this, in every instance is *proof* and often the cause of their *misery*. In such cases, misery rises to the exact proportion to the strength of desire. Now to reason justly, we must conclude, that

if God possess *infinite* wisdom, he could never intend any thing to take place, or be, that will not take place, or be; nor that which is, or will be, not to be, at the time when it is. And it must be considered erroneous to suppose that the *Allwise* ever desired any thing to take place, which by his wisdom, he knew would not; as such a supposition must in effect, suppose a degree of *misery* in the *eternal mind equal* to the *strength* of his *fruitless desire!* Were this the case, all the misery to which mortals are subject, bears not the thousandth part of the proportion to the miseries of the Divine Being, as the smallest imaginable atom does to the weight of the ponderous globe; providing, at the same time, the idea of infinity is attached to Deity! Again, if we admit of a disappointment to the Supreme Being, even in the smallest matter of consideration, it follows, that we have no satisfactory evidence whereby to prove that any thing, at present, in the whole universe, is as the Supreme intended. All the harmonies of nature, which to the eye of wondering man, are so convincing of the existence of that power, wisdom and goodness which he adores, may have continued their laws in active force much longer than God intended; brought into existence millions of beings more than were contemplated in creation; and by this time become a perfect nuisance to the general plan of the Almighty. The admission of the error refuted, would sink the mind to the nether parts of moral depravity, where darkness reigns with all its horrors.

The above arguments are introduced to show the absurdity of admitting a violation of the intention of the Supreme Legislator.

I now turn on the other side, and admit as a fact, what I have sufficiently refuted, viz. that the inten-

tions of *God* as a *Supreme Legislator* are *violated* by the *sin* of *finite beings;* but must beg leave to inform the reader that the proposition will by no means afford the intended consequences; but yields me an argument in favor of the *finite* nature of *sin*, which I do not want, and of which I shall make no other use than to *explode* the *proposition itself*. If any intention of Deity were ever thwarted, it proves, without evasion, that he is not *infinite;* if so, his *will*, or *intention*, *cannot* be *infinite;* and, therefore, the consequences intended by the proposition are forever lost, as they exist only upon the supposition of his being *infinite*. If it be argued, that the intentions of Deity, as a legislator, are violated, not strictly in an *infinite sense*, but in some *subordinate degree* it is giving up the ground contended for, to all intents; for, if the *intention violated*, be not *infinite*, the *sin* of *violating* it, cannot be *infinite*.

Again, if sin be infinite and unlimited, it cannot be superseded by any principle or being in the universe; for goodness cannot be more than *infinite*, neither is there a degree for Deity to occupy above it. And it may be further argued, that the admission of the error refuted, would be a denial of any *Supreme Being* in the universe; for, as Deity does not supersede sin, he cannot be *superior* to that which is *equal* to *himself*.

Again, I further inquire, can that be considered as an *infinite evil*, which is *limited* in its *consequences?* The answer must be in the negative. If sin be an *infinite evil*, and *infinite* in its *consequences* as an *evil*, not only all created beings must suffer endlessly by it, but God himself can never cease to experience the torment-giving power of that which he is unable to avoid; I say more, if sin be *infinite* and *unlimited*, for it must be *unlimited*, if it be *infinite*,

it follows that there is no such principle in the universe, as any one property which we are *wont* to *attribute* to the Almighty; for, if once we admit a principle of *divine justice* to have an existence, it is granted that sin is bounded by it, and therefore cannot be infinite; and it is a fact that sin can no where exist, only where it can be compared with justice. Again, it ought not to be supposed, that the intentions of Deity were ever violated, if we admit, at the same time, that he had power to avoid such violation. And who, in their senses, will say, that that which is unavoidable by God, is avoidable by man?

Enough, undoubtedly, is said, to show the egregious mistake of supposing sin to be infinite; and more need not be written on the subject were it not by some contended, that Job xxii. 5, is in full proof of the *infinity* of sin. "Is not thy wickedness great? and thine iniquities infinite? In answer to this passage, I need only turn the reader to chap. xlii. 7, "And it was so, that after the Lord had spoken these words unto Job, the Lord said unto Eliphaz the Timnite, my wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends, for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath." Observe, kind reader the words which are brought to prove the infinity of sin, are neither the words of God, nor of one whom he approved; but they are the words of that Timnite, against whom God's anger was kindled, for not speaking the thing that was right.

Once more, and I close this part of my query:—If sin be infinite in its nature, there can be no one sin greater than another. The smallest offence aagainst the good of society, is equal to *blasphemy* against the Holy Ghost. If what we call a small crime, be not infinite, the greatest cannot be, provid-

viding there is any proportion between the great and the small. Are not the words of Christ, Matt. xii. 31, where he speaks of sins and blasphemies that should be forgiven unto men, and of blasphemies that should not be forgiven men, a sufficient evidence that some sins are more heinous than others? Again, 1 Epistle of John, v. 16, where some sins are said to be not unto death, and some unto death, &c.

Now, admitting the matter proved, that sin is not infinite, it follows, of course, that it is proved to be finite. However we will now attend to the direct evidences of the finite nature of sin.

The law which takes cognizance of sin is not infinite, it being produced by the legislature which I have before noticed, viz. a capacity to understand, connected with the causes and means of knowledge. In order for a law to be infinite, the legislature must be so; but man's ability to understand is finite and all the means which are in his power for the acquisition of knowledge are finite; all his knowledge is circumscribed, and the law produced by such causes must be like them, not infinite but finite. An infinite law would be far above the capacity of a finite being, and it would be unreasonable to suppose man amenable to a law above his capacity. All our knowledge of good and evil is obtained by comparison. We call an action evil by comparing it with one which we call good. Were it in our power to embrace all the consequences that are connected with our actions in our intentions, our meanings would seldom be what they now are. Had it been so with the brethen of Joseph, when they sold him to the Ishmaelites, that they then knew all the consequences which would attend the event, they would not have meant it, as they did, for evil, but *seeing with* perfectly unbeclouded eyes their own

salvation, and that of the whole family of promise, they would have meant it for good, as did the Almighty who superintended the affair. Now the act of selling Joseph was sin, in the meaning of those who sold him; but it was finite, considered as sin, for it was bounded by the narrowness of their understandings, limited by their ignorance, and circumscribed by the wisdom and goodness of him who meant it for good. If this sin had been infinite, nothing we can justly call good, could have been the consequence; but whoever read the event without seeing that the best of consequences were connected with it?

The promised seed, in whom all the families of the earth are to be blessed, according to the word of promise to Abraham, was to descend from that family which was preserved through seven years of famine, as a consequence of the good intended in that event. And who but God can comprehend the infinite good contained in all the glorious plan of meditorial grace? We then see, that what in a limited sense, we may justly call sin, or evil, in an unlimited sense is justly called good. We say, of the top of yonder mountain, it is exceedingly high; and of yonder valley, it is low; and this we justly say, by comparing one with the other, in respect to the centre of our earth. But the moment we extend our thoughts to contemplate the millions of worlds in unbounded space, and take the whole in one grand system, the idea of high and low is lost. So is sin finished, when, by divine grace, our understandings are enlightened, and we hear our spiritual Joseph say, "Grieve not yourselves, ye *meant* it unto *evil*, but God *meant* it unto *good*." It will be granted, on all sides, that no action unconnected with design ought to be *considered* sin; it is then an evil intention

that constitutes an evil action. For instance, a man exerting himself to the utmost of his abilities to save the life of his neighbor, accidentally takes his life, the consequence is not the guilt of murder, but heart-aching grief for the loss of his friend. Again, a man exerting himself with all his ingenuity and strength to take the life of his neighbor, misses his intention and saves his life from immediate danger; the consequence is not the approbation of a good conscience for having saved the life of his neighbor, but condemnation for having designed his death, and perhaps mortification in his disappointment. By these instances, the reader may see, that no act can be determined to be morally good, or evil, by the consequences which follow, but only by the disposition, or intention, which the actor possesses when the act is done. Then, in order for the sin to be infinite, the intention of the transgressor must be infinite, embracing all the consequences that can ever arise from what he does; but this is never the case with finite beings. We never know all the effects or consequences, that will be produced from the smallest of those acts which we do in time. It is the immediate consequences which we have in our power to calculate upon, and in them we are often deceived. Our acts as moral accountables, are all limited to the narrow circle of our understanding; therefore our goodness is limited, being of the finite nature of our knowledge, and our sin is in the same finite and limited circle. It may be argued very justly, that as no finite cause can produce an infinite effect, no finite creature can commit an infinite sin; and as every effect must stand in relation to its cause, so man being finite, cannot be the cause of an evil which does not stand in relation to man the finite cause. Should the reader suppose, that my admit-

ting the act of selling Joseph was attended with unlimited consequences, in opposition to my sentiment wherein I limit all actions which originate in finite causes; I reply, as the act of selling Joseph respected the purpose of Deity, and the plan of grace, those who sold him do not stand as even the *shadow of a cause*, but only as instruments, by which God effected his own divine and gracious purpose. Perhaps the reader by this time, is ready to say, according to this reasoning, there can be no such things as *real evil* in the universe. If, by real evil, be meant something that ought not to be, in respect to all the consequences which attend it, I cannot admit of its existence; for I cannot conceive of any productive cause whatever, that can be, strictly speaking, limited in its consequences. For instance, the first transgression of man, no one can suppose, has ceased in its consequences; for, from that cause, the knowledge of good and evil exists in moral beings, and when the effects of that knowledge will cease, I cannot imagine. If it be objected, that to call that a sin which produces an infinite continuance of good effects, must be absurd; I say, in reply, the objection comes too late; for it is already proved, that the consequences of an act do not determine whether the act be good or evil.

I have, in the foregoing queries, spoken of that kind of sin which is productive of remorse; however, we read, besure, of the sin of ignorance, see Num. xv. 27, &c.; but this I conceive to be more of a legal than of a moral nature, and it is sometimes called error; it is in a thousand instances productive of sorrow and disappointment, but never of guilt. If we consider the Jews under this law, or the Gentiles, who, the apostle says, were a law unto themselves, we shall find them exposed to guilt, on

the same principles. Therefore, moral transgression must vary, as the knowledge and understanding of men vary, in various circumstances.

If it be thought by the reader, that I have passed over the spirit of the law, which is love to God in a superlative degree, and an esteem for our neighbors equal to that which we have for ourselves; I answer, I have not altogether passed by it. This law of divine love is that infinite law of perfection, which is higher than our capacities extend, in a finite state. The law given to Israel, literally speaking, was only a shadow of the spirit of love; and all our knowledge of moral holiness is but a faint resemblance of that sublime rectitude from which the most upright of the sons of men are at a great distance.

Having hinted so much on the nature of sin as to make the subject plain to the reader's understanding, I will now pass to an inquiry into its cause, or origin.

The origin of sin has, among christians in general, been very easily accounted for; but in a way, I must confess, that never gave me any satisfaction, since I came to think for myself on subjects of this nature. A short chimerical story of the bard, Milton, has given perfect satisfaction to millions, respecting the introduction of moral evil into the moral system which we occupy. The substance of the account is, sometime before the creation of man, the Almighty created multitudes of spiritual beings, called angels: Some of these creatures of God were much higher in dignity and authority than others, but all perfectly destitute of sin, or moral turpitude. One dignified above all the rest, stood Prime Minister of the Almighty, clothed with the highest missive power, and clad with garments of primeval light; obsequious to nothing but the high behest of

his Creator, he discharged the functions of his office with a promptitude and dignity, suited to the eminency of his station, and to the admiration of celestial millions. But when it pleased Jehovah to reveal the brightness of his glory and the image of the Godhead in humanity, he gave forth the command, see Psalm xcvii. 7. "Worship him, all ye gods." And Heb. i. 6. "And again, when he bringeth the first begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him." Lucifer, Son of the Morning, (as Christians have called him) surprised at the idea of worshipping any being but God himself, looked on the Son with ineffable disdain, and in a moment grew indignant, brushed his strongest pinions, and waved his wings for the throne of God, challenged supremacy with the Almighty, and cast his eye to the sides of the north as a suitable place to establish his empire. Legions of spirits followed this chief in rebellion, and formed a dangerous party, in the kingdom of the Almighty. The Son of God was invested with full power as Generalissimo of Heaven, to command the remaining forces, against the common enemy. And in short, after many grievous battles between armies of contending spirits, where life could not, in the least, be exposed, Lucifer and his party were driven out of Heaven, leaving it in peace, though in a great measure, depopulated!

God having created the earth, and placed the first man and woman in a most happy situation of innocence and moral purity, without the smallest appetite for sin, or propensity to evil, the arch Apostate enviously looked from his fiery prison, to which he was consigned by the command of the Almighty, and beholding man placed in so happy a situation, and *in a capacity to* increase to infinite multitudes,

by which the kingdom of Heaven would be enlarged, was determined to crop this tree in the bud.—He, therefore, turns into a serpent, goes to the woman and beguiles her, gets her to eat of a fruit which God had forbidden, by which mean he introduced sin into our system.

I have not been particular in this sketch, but it contains the essence of the common idea. I shall now put it under examination, looking diligently for the propriety of accounting for the origin of moral evil in this way.

And first, of this memorable rebellion in heaven! It seems that this rebel angel was always obedient to the commands of his Maker, until the hour of his fall; that there was not the least spot of pollution in him, until he felt the emotions of pride, which lifted him above submission to the Son of God. This being the case, I ask, was this angel ignorant of the real character of the Son, whom he was commanded to worship? If he were not, but knew it to be no other than the true Eternal, his Creator, manifested in a nature which Jehovah created; if he loved his Maker as he ought to do, which none will pretend to dispute; he would have worshipped him with due reverence, the moment he made the discovery and heard the command: This no person in his senses will dispute. If he did not know the real character whom he was commanded to worship, had he complied, he would have worshipped, he knew not what. And nothing can be more absurd, than to suppose that infinite wisdom would command his creatures to worship ignorantly. I ask, further, could purity produce impurity; or moral holiness, unholiness? All answer, no. Was not the angel holy in every faculty? Was not the *command, for* him to worship the Son, holy and

just? All answer, yes. Then from such causes, how was sin produced? The reader will easily see, the question cannot be answered. Now, reader, be so kind as to turn to the scripture, to which I have referred you on this subject, and see if we have any authority for saying, that either gods or angels refused to worship, when commanded. "Again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, let all the angels of God worship him." That this first begotten is Christ, no doubt will be entertained. But when was he brought into the world? before or since the first transgression of man? Since, most certainly. Then, supposing millions of angels had sinned at that time, it could have had no consequence productive of man's transgression, as a cause cannot be posterior to its effects. Therefore, to suppose, that those angels who never sinned until long after man became a transgressor, were the instigators of what is called the fall, discovers a want of calculation. And further, what authority have we for believing that the command was disobeyed? We find nothing connected with either passage, viz. that in Psalms or that in Hebrews, which intimates a refusal among the gods, or angels. And I see no need of supposing, that by gods, in one text, or by angels in the other, any other beings are intended than men. In respect to the command for all the gods to worship him, I observe, "they were called gods to whom the word of God came, and the scriptures cannot be broken." And the command, for all the angels of God to worship, stands on this proper ground; by angels, are meant messengers, who are employed by God, for the information of their fellow men;—but as all those messengers, or ministers, were inferior *to the* "*Messenger* of the covenant;" whom

the Lord promised to send unto Jerusalem, it was suitable to show his superiority, by giving such a token, in the scriptures, as commanding all the angels to worship him. There is another passage in the xivth of Isaiah, 12, &c. "How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! for thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend unto heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will set also upon the mount of the congregation in the *sides* of the *north*, &c.

"Here," I have been told, "we have a particular account of the sin which Satan committed in Heaven." But as there is nothing in this passage, or its connexions, that has reference to any other creature or being, as Lucifer, Son of the Morning, than the King of Babylon, I shall say but little upon it. Observe, the question is asked, How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning? How art thou cut down to the ground, who *didst* weaken the nations? This Lucifer weakened the nations before he fell, but was unable to weaken them afterwards. He said in his heart, he would ascend unto Heaven. Was this the sin of Satan, as is generally supposed? Was he not already in Heaven? How then could he say in his heart, I will ascend unto Heaven? I will not trouble the reader with any thing so vague as the vulgar application of this scripture, only enough to show that it had no such meaning. The King of Babylon is pointed out, in this prophecy, as exalting his throne above the *stars* of God, which, in a figurative sense, undoubtedly meant his exalting himself by the reduction of the Jews, who are figuratively called the *stars of God*.

Again, this angel of light must have been very ignorant of the power and goodness of the Almighty, in order to have possessed a thought, that to rebel against him could be of any possible advantage, or that he could have carried and maintained a contest with him. If he were as ignorant as all this, the inhabitants of *Heaven* must have been extremely uncultivated, in that age of eternity, and no great ornament to a place so much famed for glory and grandeur. If Heaven, which is said to be God's throne, be, or ever were inhabited by defectable beings, the place itself must be a defectable place; and why the Almighty should take up his special abode in a defectable place, surrounded by defectable beings, I cannot imagine. But I pass on—

After Satan was turned out of Heaven, he saw no possible way to injure his adversary, only by contaminating his creatures, which he had just made, and placed in the happy situation before described. Here observe, the matter appears strange. Did God not know the evil disposition of Satan? Had he forgotten the awful difficulty but just settled? Or would he leave an innocent lamb to the ferocity of a bear robbed of her whelps? God had driven Satan from Heaven, from his own presence, but left him at loose ends to prey on his tender offspring, whom he had just left in a defenceless situation, on this ball of earth! What would appear more unnatural and shocking, than for a father to chase his enemy out at his door, but leave him to slay his defenceless children in the street? I shall, after what I have observed, beg liberty to say, I am so far from believing any such story respecting the cause of sin, that I have not even the shadow of evidence, from scripture or reason, to support the sentiment. But I have *been told*, that man, standing in a state

of sinless purity, could not have fallen from that rectitude, unless there had been some sinful being to have tempted him. Admitting there is any force in this observation, it stands as directly against the fall of Satan, without a sinful temptation, as it does against man's transgression, without a tempter. Was man more pure, before he sinned, than that holy angel in Heaven? If not, how could that angel sin, without a temptation, easier than man, who was made in a lower grade? But supposing we should admit that God commanded an angel to worship his Son Jesus, and the angel refused, and call that the first sin ever committed, it would not determine its origin or cause. A cause, or origin must exist, before an effect, or production. So, after all our journeying to heaven after a sinning angel, and after pursuing him to hell, and from hell to the earth, we have not yet answered the question, viz. What is the origin of sin? We have only shown, that the way in which this question has been generally solved, is without foundation.

Having stated what I have been told was the origin of sin, and given my reasons why I do not believe it, I now come to give my own ideas of the matter.

Scripture, with the assistance of that reason, without which, the scriptures would be of no more service to us than they are to the brute creation, I shall take for my guide, on the question before me. Almighty God is a being of infinite perfections; this the scriptures will support, and reason declare: He was the author of our existence, being the creator of the first man and woman, the occasion of their being formed of the dust of the ground, and the director of that providence by which we are all introduced by ordinary generation.

Our Maker must have had a design in the works of his hands; this the scriptures argue, and reason says. The whole of God's design must be carried into effect, and nothing more, admitting him to be an infinite being. We are informed, that God created man in his own image; that he blessed him, and set him over the works of his hands; and reason cannot deny the truth of it. But what was this image of God, in which man was created? Answer, it was Christ, who, in scripture, is called "the beginning of the creation of God;" who, St. Paul says, is the brightness of the Father's glory, and express image of his person. Now there is no need of saying much, where the truth is easy to come at. If Christ be the image of God, and man was created in God's image, it is plain, that man was created in Christ, was blessed in Christ, and in Christ set over the works of God's hands. After God had finished his work of creation, consecrated the seventh day, and rested from his labor, we are informed that there was not a man to till the ground. This information is reasonable, and authorizes me to say, that as man stood in his *created* character, which is Christ, the heavenly man, he was not, at that time, formed of the dust of the ground, was not of the earth earthly, and was therefore not a tiller of the ground. We are then informed, by the sacred text, that God *formed* (not created) man of the dust of the ground, breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, whereby man became a living soul, or creature. Man is now a partaker of flesh and blood; is, as the apostle says, "*made subject* to *vanity*, not willingly, but by reason of him who subjected the same in hope." He has now, not an immortal, but a mortal constitution; is possessed of natural appetites and passions; and being *unacquainted* with the ways of his own

imperfect self, knew neither the good or evil of a mortal state. If it be said, that man was not mortal, before he sinned, and that he became mortal by sin, it is a saying as distant from good reason as imagination can go. For if man were not *mortal* before transgression, he must have been *immortal;* if he were *immortal,* he was not subject to change, but remains still in the same *immortal* state; and all our notions about the mortality of man is nothing but a groundless chimera. But every day's experience contradicts such absurdities.

Man, according to these statements, is of heavenly extraction; is, in his nature, allied to the heavenly state, in which he was created, before he was formed of the dust of the ground. And I call on the reason of my reader to testify to the rationality of the idea. If the mind, spirit, soul, or whatever the reader pleases to call the immortal part of man, originated from the earthly nature of the formed creature, what is the reason that the good, which supports the formed nature, does not satisfy the soul? Our natural appetites originate in the elements of which our bodies are composed, and aliment produced from them sufficient to satisfy any natural appetite of the body; but can it give a cup of consolation to the heavenly stranger within? No; her food is of a different kind. Was the earth, with all her mines and fruits, my own, this moment, on condition that I should give up the riches which I see in this heavenly relation, my bargain would make me poor.

As man stood in his formed state, clothed with mortal flesh and blood, before his mind became obsequious to the elementary passions, a law was shadowed to his mind from the heavenly and spiritual man. The full spirit, power and beauty of the law,

were not perfectly understood, only a shadow of the heavenly nature passed on his mind, and the nature of that spirit being eternal, and immortally pure, was opposed to the passions which would immediately rise from the fleshy nature, and said in the understanding of the creature already made subject to vanity, *yield not to the passions and powers of the flesh for they are death.* But immediately the powerful vibrations of the fleshy nature absorbed his mind, he sought to the carnal man for food, ate and died. These things are figuratively represented, in the scriptures. There man is represented as being placed in a garden of delights, to keep it and to dress it. The tree of life was in it, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; he was bid welcome to the tree of life, but was forbidden the other. A subtle serpent comes to the woman, and tempts her with the forbidden fruit; she eats, and gives it to her husband, and he also partakes: Their eyes are opened to the knowledge of good and evil; they see that they are naked, and hide themselves from God; sew fig-leaves together for garments to hide their nakedness. God comes into the garden, in the cool of the day, calls for the man, and asks him if he had eaten of the forbidden fruit. He answers, that the woman whom God gave him, gave unto him and he ate. The woman is next interrogated, and she lays it to the serpent's guile. The ground is cursed, for Adam's sake; when he tills it, it is to produce briars and thorns; he is to eat his bread, by the sweat of his face, and at last return to the dust. The woman's conception was to be multiplied in sorrow, and her desire was to be to her husband, and he was to rule over her. The serpent was cursed above all cattle, was to go on his belly, and to eat dust as long as he lived. This is, in short,

the scripture representation of the first sin; and I consider it to be figurative.

That the Almighty ever planted a literal garden on earth, without using man as an instrument by which he did it, I have not evidence enough to believe. The garden, undoubtedly meant the moral state in which man was placed, which like a garden would become foul, if it were not dressed and kept. The tree of life, was then, what it is now, the law of the spirit of *life* in Christ Jesus; and the *little* of that spirit which was then manifested, was all the *moral* life which man possessed at that time; and, therefore, all which he was able to sin against. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil, was what it is now, the fleshy nature, which I have before described. The opposition of the law of the heavenly man, to that of the fleshly, is meant by the prohibition. The serpent signifies the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, is not subject to the law of the heavenly man, neither indeed can be. The carnal mind getting the victory over the *law* of *life*, in the understanding of the creature, is meant by the woman's being deceived. Adam is here the figure of him who was to come; and his partaking with the woman, shows that Christ would bear the infirmities of human nature, his bride, who, in respect to individuality, should be multiplied in sorrow, but should finally turn her desire towards her Redeemer, and he should protect her. The serpent, the cursed, is the carnal mind. His going on his belly, signifies his always being moved by fleshly lusts; and his feeding on dust, teaches that carnal mindedness never feeds on heavenly things, but on things of an earthly nature. And we may justly observe, that after all the cultivation which is bestow-

ed on the carnal or fleshy nature, it produces nothing better than briars and thorns.

Should it be said, that this garden was a literal garden, that the tree of life was a literal tree, and that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was also literal; I should be glad to be informed, what evidence can be educed in support of such an idea. Where is the garden now? Where is the tree of life now? Where is the tree of knowledge of good and evil now? Are those trees now growing on the earth as literal trees? We are not informed, in the scripture, that this garden was carried off to heaven, or that either of those trees was removed. It is written, that God drove the man whom he had made out of the garden, and placed cherubims and a flaming sword at the east of the garden, to prevent the man from approaching the tree of life. If the garden were literal, why could not Adam have gone into it on the north, south, or west side? But the *east* is the *birth-place* of *light*, and the cherubims and the flaming sword represent the law with its executive authority, which produces guilt or condemnation in the mind, and which is the death Adam died on the very day of transgression.

The path-way of understanding is now open and clear. *God* saw fit, in his plan of divine wisdom, to make the creature subject to vanity; to give him a mortal constitution; to fix in his nature those faculties which would, in their operation, oppose the spirit of the heavenly nature. It is, therefore, said, that *God put enmity* between the seed of the woman, and that of the serpent. And it was by the passions which arose from the fleshy nature, that the whole mind became carnal, and man was captivated thereby. But perhaps the objector will say, this denies the *liberty of the will*, and makes God the author of

sin. To which I reply, desiring the reader to recollect what I have said of sin in showing its nature; by which it is discovered, that God may be the innocent and holy cause of that, which, in a limited sense, is sin; but as it respects the meaning of God, it is intended for good. It is not casting any disagreeable reflections on the Almighty, to say he determined all things for good; and to believe he supercedes all the affairs of the universe, not excepting sin, is a million times more to the honor of God than to believe he *cannot*, or that he does not when he can. The reader will then ask, if God must be considered as the first, the holy, and the innocent cause of sin, is there any unholy or impure causes? I answer, there is, but in a limited sense. There is no divine holiness in any fleshly or carnal exercise; there is no holiness nor purity in all the deceptions ever experienced by imperfect beings; and these are the immediate causes of sin; and as such, they make the best of men on earth groan, and cry out, "Who shall deliver me from the *body* of this *death?*"

If it should be granted, that sin will finally terminate for good, in the moral system, it will then be necessary to admit that God is its first cause, or we cannot say that God is the author of all good. If we say, that sin is not for the good of God's system, but is a damage, we must also say that God would have prevented its taking place, if it had been in his power; if it were not in his power, he is not Almighty; neither can we say he is Supreme in an unlimited sense, as he was not superior to the causes which produced sin. But, to say, that God is the author of sin, says the reader, sounds very *badly*, let you put what coloring you please upon it; *and if I believed* it, I should not dare to say it.

Well, what shall I say, in order to please? Say the Devil was the author of sin. But did the Devil make himself? No; God made him an holy angel, and he made himself a devil, by transgression. Well, God made an angel, and that angel made a devil of himself, or any thing else, proves that God was the first cause as *directly* as any thing which I have argued. The objector will further say, that that angel was made a moral agent, and therefore ought to be considered the author of his own sin. But I say, in reply, that if God produced an agency, and that agency produced sin, it argues that God is the first cause, and agency the second and effective cause. If this mode of reasoning be faulted, I ask, is not God the origin and cause of all moral righteousness? None can be perverse enough to say no; then I ask, again, If moral agency, created by God, be not the *original* cause of moral *righteousness*, by what rule of reasoning can it be made the *original* cause of *transgression?* But I have before refuted the notion about this sinning angel. I now call the attention of the reader to man, which is our proper study; and attend to the objection as it respects the liberty of the will. But, in the first place, for the sake of the argument, I will consent to any liberty of the will which is contended for; and then ask, what was the cause of man's having liberty of will? My opponent must allow it was God. Well, if God produced a *liberty* of *will* in man, and that liberty of will produced sin, is there any great difficulty in seeing, that that is making God the original cause of sin, in every sense in which I have argued? What would the objector wish to be understood mean, by will? If it be any thing more or less choice, I am at a loss about it. If it be choice, what we *have to* look into, is the liberty of

choice. In order for choice to take place, the mind must have perceptions of two, or more objects; and that object which has the most influence on the judgment and passions, will be the chosen object; and *choice*, in this instance, has not even the *shadow* of *liberty*. None will be vain enough to say, that will, or choice, has any liberty before it exists, and choice does not exist until an object is chosen; and to say, choice has liberty to refuse an object after it is chosen, is using violence on terms. And the same will be the conclusion if we take the word *will*. A person is invited, by two friends, to make them a visit the same afternoon, at their respective houses; he wishes to visit both but cannot at the same time. In this circumstance, honored with both their invitations, he feels at a real loss what answer to make; both insist on his compliance, with equal earnestness, and with equal influence on his judgment and passions, he still remains without a determination. To end the affair, one of his friends says, I will go with you, this afternoon, and visit our friend, if you and he will return the visit next week. This decides in the mind of him who was first invited, as the other consents to the proposal. Now, *choice*, or *will*, is in favor of visiting, according to the last proposal made. Until the man willed to go, the will to go did not exist; it could have no liberty before it did exist; and after it did, to say, that that will which was to go one way, was at liberty to go the other, is using the violence before mentioned. It is then evident, that will, or choice, has no possible liberty. The objector will now move his position, and say, it is the mind that has this *liberty* to choose, or not choose; to will, or not will. In order to determine this *matter justly*, I first ask, does the power of choos-

ing exist in the mind, or in the object chosen? If it be answered, that the power of choice is in the mind, and not in the object which influences the mind, the man who was at a loss to determine which of his friends to visit, while the objects were in equal force on his mind, was entirely ignorant of it; and admitting it was so, it might as well have been otherwise, for the power of choosing in his mind, did him no good; he was after all, dependent on a certain circumstance, which, being attached to one object, made it preferable to the other.—Again, admitting the power of choice to be attributed to the mind, and not to the object which gives perceptions to the mind and influences it, it must be as easy for the mind to chose a *minor*, as a *major* object. It will be granted, on all sides, that persons may choose an object in preference to another, which is not half so valuable; but this is always in consequence of error in judgment. Now it is as objects appear to the mind, that we ought to consider them in our present query. Supposing a poor man, who has a wife and some hungry children to feed, is offered a dollar or a guinea, for a day's work; he does not know the value of either, not being acquainted with money, or its value, or the nature of the metals which are stamped with value. He consults, or means to consult the good of those for whom he is willing to labor, and would if possible receive that which would do the most towards removing their wants; and says to himself, the dollar is much the largest, and the probability is, it is worth three times as much as the guinea; it is finally his opinion that that is the case. Now I ask in relation to my argument, which of those pieces of money will he be most likely to choose? The answer is the dollar. But I ask, why? If his mind be

at *real liberty*, it is no more attached to the dollar than to the guinea; the influence which the dollar has on his mind more than the guinea, destroys not the *liberty* of the mind to choose the guniea; I wish to be told, why he is more likely to choose the dollar than the guinea. Or, to alter the statement, so that the mind is not deceived. The man perfectly knows the value of both guinea and dollar. The good of his wanting family is what he means to consult; which will he be most likely to choose, in this case? answer, the guinea. I ask, again, why? Is there any reason, or is there not? There is, and it is the greater value. Then the object governs the choice. I ask, in the above instance, had the mind any *power* or *liberty* to choose the object which appeared of the least value, and refuse that which appeared of the greatest? I am sure there is not a person in the world who would say that it had. Again, admitting, for the sake of the argument that the mind possesses this imaginary liberty; I then ask, how came it to possess such liberty? Answer, *God* gave it. Then the matter stands thus, *God* produced a mind, and gave it liberty to will, or choose, and it wills or chooses; I ask, what is the original cause of this willing and choosing? The reader will easily see, that if I grant my opponent's arguments, it will not be to his advantage. Again, for the last time, if God gave to man a *liberty* whereby he can choose or refuse the same object, did he not give his creature a liberty which he did not possess himself? Did not the Infinitely Wise eternally know all that he himself would do? It must be granted. Then I ask, again, does he possess any liberty in his nature, whereby it is in his power to abandon the general system contained in his divine *omnisciency*, and embrace one entirely different? I *am sure there* are but few in the world who would not

say, as did the apostle, "He cannot deny himself." If the creature possess any ability which is not in his Creator, I would ask, first, where he got it? And, secondly, if the Almighty knew all the consequences which would arise from such an ability? If the answer be in the negative, it argues that his wisdom is finite and limited, and that he does not know but this *unaccountable* ability of willing and choosing may finally destroy his whole plan in creation, providence and redemption! If it be granted, that he did know all the consequences that would arise from this ability of willing and choosing, which is called liberty of will, it is denying its existence. For if those consequences are all *known*, it argues they were all *certain*, and none of them avoidable.

Having, as I hope, to the reader's satisfaction, answered the objections in respect to the liberty of the will, I would again invite him back to our subject.

The immediate causes of sin are found in our natural constitutions, and the most *distant* of those *immediate* causes are the same as the most *distant* of the *immediate* causes of our *virtues;* but the most immediate causes of our virtues and our vices are extremely different. For instance, two men meet at an inn; both of them have families which are in want of bread; they have each fifty cents, which they have just taken for their days work. One says, to the other, come, sit down, and we will take some drink, for our comfort, after a hard day's labor. The other reflects in his mind, and says to himself, to let my children suffer, at home, gratify my company in what is indifferent to me, would be abominable, having no particular appetite for spirits; he, therefore, refuses, bids his companion *good night,* goes and purchases necessary pro-

visions for his family, and goes home. He has done as a virtuous honest husband ought to do. The other possesses a violent appetite for ardent spirits; the moment he comes where it is, his want of it overpowers his love and duty to his family, the latter object being at a distance, and the former being nigh; he calls for drink until he spends his fifty cents, and then goes home to his expecting family intoxicated. In this, according to the scriptures, though he were a professed christian, he is worse than an infidel.

In the mirror presented, the reader may see, that those two men acted equally alike from their natural wants, appetites and passions. Had neither of them any wants, appetites or passions, neither of them would have done any thing at all. They would not have labored for the money; and if they had the money, they would not have laid it out in *any* way possible. Therefore, we see, that want, appetite and passion, in one, produced *virtue*, and in the other *vice*. But, the still more immediate causes were not the same in both persons; and the consequence to them, in a moral sense, differ as much, as did the most immediate circumstances which produced their conduct. One felt the approbation of a good conscience in having done what cool dispassionate reason dictated; the other, as soon as his eyes are opened to see what he has done, is struck with condemnation, for having violated the dictates of that law of prudence and equity, of which he was susceptible.

A beggar influenced by hunger, calls at the door of the affluent for food, he knows it is there, his appetite is good, the *object magnifies* to his *senses*; but by one who knows the *love* of *property* more than *the want of food*, he is sternly denied. The beggar

prostrates himself and moves his *suit* in *language* of *distress*, reducing his *petition to only a piece of bread;* the covetous man is a little moved, with some small feelings of *compassion*, but fearing that if he should bestow, he should consequently be troubled again, bids the beggar depart, and leaves him. The beggar's object was food, and his passion hunger; he acted up to the influence of his object, and did all in his power to obtain it. The other's object was the saving of his property, and his passion was covetousness; he acted up to the influence of his object, to the gratification of his passion. Now, had the circumstance been varied so much as this, that he did not think his giving, at that time, would ever induce him to call again, the probability is, his object and his passion would both have been different; to feed an hungry man, would have been his object, and charity his passion.

Man's *main* object, in all he does, is *happiness;* and were it not for that, he never could have any other *particular* object. What would induce men to form societies; to be at the expense of supporting government; to acquire knowledge; to learn the sciences, or till the earth, if they believed they could be as happy without, as with? The fact is, man would not be the being that he now is, as there would not be any stimulus to action; he must become *inert*, therefore cease to be. As men are never without this grand object, so they are never without their wants, which render such an object desirable. But their minor objects vary, according their understandings vary, and their passions dif-

Then, says the objector, there is no such as *disinterested benevolence*. I answer, words used to communicate ideas; there is that, often, experience, which is meant by disinterested

benevolence. An American is travelling in Europe he meets, in the street, a young and beautiful *fair bathed in tears,* her *breast swollen with grief,* and he *countenance perfectly sad.* His heart, fraught wit the *keenest sensibility* is moved compassionately t inquire the cause of her *grief;* he is informed tha her father, in a late sickness, became indebted t his physician twenty guineas, for which he was tha hour committed to gaol, when he had but partiall recovered his health. Our traveller no soone hears the story, than he advances the twenty guinea to discharge the debt, and gives her fifty more as reward for her generous concern. As our travelle did not expect any *pecuniary reward,* either *directl* or *indirectly,* his *charity* is called *disinterested benev olence.* But, strickly speaking, he was greatly *inter ested;* he was *interested* in the afflictions of fathe and child; their relief was his object, and charit his passion. Now did he not act for his own hap piness? Yes, as much as ever a man did in life What must have been his misery, possessing th same disposition, without the means to relieve And what a sublime satisfaction he enjoyed, by th bestowment of his favor! Sacred truth informs us "It is more blessed to give, than to receive."

We find some men honest and industrions; wh think, and think justly, that happiness is not to b found in any other way. Others are indolent an knavish, and they expect to obtain happiness in s being. But they are deceived in their objects; an will finally learn, that they must be, what conscienc has often told them they ought to be, honest an just, in order to be happy.

The objector will say, to admit that our happi ness, is the grand object of all we do, destroys th *purity of religion,* and reduces the whole to noth

ing but selfishness. To which, I reply, a man acting for his own happiness, if he seek it in the heavenly system of *universal benevolence*, knowing that his own happiness is connected with the happiness of his fellow men, which induces him to do justly, and to deal mercifully with all men, he is no more *selfish* than he ought to be. But a man acting for his own happiness, if he seek it in the *narrow circle* of *partiality* and *covetousness*, his *selfishness* is *irreligious* and *wicked*.

I know it is frequently contended, that we ought to love God for what he is, and not for what we receive from him; that we ought to love holiness for holiness' sake, and not for any advantage such a principle is to us. This is what I have often been told, but what I never could see any reason for, or propriety in. I am asked, if I love an orange; I answer I never tasted of one; but am told, I must love the orange for what it is! Now I ask, is it possible for me either to like or dislike the orange, in reality, until I taste it? Well, I taste of it, and like it. Do you like it? says my friend. Yes, I reply, its flavor is exquisitely agreeable. But that will not do, says my friend; you must not like it because its taste is agreeable, but you must like it because it is an orange. If there be any propriety in what my friend says it is out of my sight. A man is travelling on the sands of Arabia, he finds no water for a number of days; the sun scorches, and he is exceedingly dry; at last, he finds water and drinks to his satisfaction; never did water taste half so agreeably before. To say, that this man loves the water because it is water, and not because of the advantage which he receives from it, betrays a large share of inconsistency. Would not this thirsty traveller have loved the burning sand as well

as he did the water, if it had tasted as agreeably, and quenched his thirst as well? The sweet Psalmist of Israel said, "*O taste* and see that the *Lord is good.*" And an apostle says, "We love him *because he first loved us.*" What attribute do we ascribe to God, that we do not esteem on account of its advantage to us? Justice would have been no more likely to be attributed to the Almighty than injustice, if it had not first been discovered that justice was of greater advantage to mankind than injustice. And so of power, were it of no more advantage to human society than weakness; the latter would have been as likely to have been esteemed an attribute of God, as the former. If wisdom were of no greater service to man than folly, it would not have been adored in the Almighty, any more than folly. If love were no more happifying to man than hatred, hatred would as soon have been esteemed an attribute of God, as love.

Undoubtedly the Almighty loves without an influential object, as it would be erroneous to suppose that an infinite being could be operated upon. He loves because his nature is to love. An apostle says, "God is love." The sun does not shine, because our earth influences it; it is the nature of the sun to shine. But all created beings love, because of influential objects; and they always love according to the influence which objects have on their minds and passions. It seems then, says the objector, that our vices are not to be attributed to the devil, but to the influence which objects have on our minds. Surely the reader ought to expect, that after I have denied the existence of a being, I should, likewise deny his power. Perhaps, however, the reader may be surprised, to find that I do *not believe in* the existence of a being so univer-

sally acknowledged among christian people, and which perhaps, has been of as much advantage to some, as the *Goddess Dianna* was to the *craftsmen of Ephesus.* But I am willing to give my reasons for not believing with the multitude, in this particular. A created individual being cannot be in more than one place at the same time. But how many *millions* of places must this evil angel be in, at once, in order to perform the business which christians have allotted him? In order for me to believe in such a being, I must give him the omnipresency of the Almighty, which belongs to none, in my opinion, but my Maker. Again, to admit the existence of such a being, would be of no avail, as there is nothing for him to do. There is, says the objector; he tempts men to sin. But does he tempt men contrary to their passions and the influence of their motives? Answer, no. Then the temptation is of no possible consequence. Supposing a man to be exceedingly hungry, and an agreeable meal is set before him, and he invited to refresh; at that moment, the devil comes and tempts him to eat. What effect would the temptation have on the hungry man? Or supposing, in room of tempting him to eat, he should tempt him not to eat, would he be likely to succeed? But what means the scripture, which speaks of a devil? one who was a liar from the beginning, &c. I answer, I have no objection to believing, that there is *such* a *devil* as the *scripture speaks of.* He is called the old Serpent, and the same I have described, which beguiled the woman in the beginning; and it is the carnal mind which is enmity against God. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman," said the Lord, between her seed and thy seed." An apostle says, the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit

against the flesh, that ye cannot do the things ye would." And, that this was the first beguiler, we may learn, from the scripture, which saith, "*Lust*, when it conceived, brought forth sin; and, sin when it was finished, brought forth death." An apostle also says, "When a man is *tempted*, he is *drawn away* with his own lusts, and enticed. Any person, who is wholly dictated by a fleshly mind, may justly be called a devil, as in the case of Judas and Peter. As our Lord said to the Jews, also, "Ye are of your father, the devil; and the lusts of your father, ye will do." But says the objector, do you think our Saviour was tempted by the powers of the flesh, when it was said, he was tempted by the devil? I ask in my turn, for what is this particular circumstance introduced? If we cannot prove, from our own experience, that we are tempted by some other being than our own fleshly appetites, would it be any thing more than a speculative belief, to admit another tempter? But says the objector, that does not answer the question. Then let us look at his temptations; when he hungered, he was tempted; by what? and to what? Answer, by hunger, to turn stones into bread. Here was a fleshly appetite. When he had a view of all the kingdoms of the earth, and their worldly glory, he was tempted to avail himself of them. Here was natural ambition, such as gave rise to the victories of an Alexander. When on the pinnacle of the temple, he was tempted to cast himself down, as it was written concerning him, that God would give his angels charge over him, &c. Here was that passion which gives rise to presumption, and wishes to avoid duty. But it is said, the *devil taketh him about*, thus and so; not literally, however, for there is no *mountain* in the *world that* commands a *prospect* of but a *small part*

of the *kingdoms* of the *world*. The *exceeding high mountain* on which our Redeemer stood, when he saw all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, was the mountain of *human pride*. Remember, when a person is *on* a mountain, the mountain is *beneath his feet*. So was this mountain of *human pride beneath the feet* of our sinless Redeemer; but at the same time, it gave him a prospect of all which the world calls great and glorious. In a word, the scriptures inform us, that he was tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin. If, therefore, we know how we are tempted, we know, also, how he was tempted. It is a sentiment of mine, that we ought not to argue that for truth, in matters of this nature, which we have no knowledge of, by experience.

Having illustrated the original cause, and the secondary causes of sin, I pass to take notice of its consequences.

In order to have our work plain before us, I observe, sin is the fruits of the flesh, which are opposed to that true light, which lighteth every man who cometh into the world. And St. Paul says, they are manifest. See Gal. v. 19, 20, 21. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envying, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." These are the sins which our fleshly minds are daily producing, and their consequences are witnessed by [illegible]iserable world. By these sins, with their asso[illegible]tes, mankind are rendered miserable indeed. [illegible]ial and domestic happiness is frequently de[illegible]ed. *Cold* and *cruel jealousy* murders the soft [illegible]nder *passions* of love, as Cain slew his broth-

at *real liberty*, it is no more attached to the dollar than to the guinea; the influence which the dollar has on his mind more than the guinea, destroys not the *liberty* of the mind to choose the guniea; I wish to be told, why he is more likely to choose the dollar than the guinea. Or, to alter the statement, so that the mind is not deceived. The man perfectly knows the value of both guinea and dollar. The good of his wanting family is what he means to consult; which will he be most likely to choose, in this case? answer, the guinea. I ask, again, why? Is there any reason, or is there not? There is, and it is the greater value. Then the object governs the choice. I ask, in the above instance, had the mind any *power* or *liberty* to choose the object which appeared of the least value, and refuse that which appeared of the greatest? I am sure there is not a person in the world who would say that it had. Again, admitting, for the sake of the argument that the mind possesses this imaginary liberty; I then ask, how came it to possess such liberty? Answer, *God* gave it. Then the matter stands thus, *God* produced a mind, and gave it liberty to will, or choose, and it wills or chooses; I ask, what is the original cause of this willing and choosing? The reader will easily see, that if I grant my opponent's arguments, it will not be to his advantage. Again, for the last time, if God gave to man a *liberty* whereby he can choose or refuse the same object, did he not give his creature a liberty which he did not possess himself? Did not the Infinitely Wise eternally know all that he himself would do? It must be granted. Then I ask, again, does he possess any liberty in his nature, whereby it is in his power to abandon the general system contained in his divine *omnisciency*, and embrace one entirely different? I *am sure there* are but few in the world who would not

say, as did the apostle, "He cannot deny himself." If the creature possess any ability which is not in his Creator, I would ask, first, where he got it? And, secondly, if the Almighty knew all the consequences which would arise from such an ability? If the answer be in the negative, it argues that his wisdom is finite and limited, and that he does not know but this *unaccountable* ability of willing and choosing may finally destroy his whole plan in creation, providence and redemption! If it be granted, that he did know all the consequences that would arise from this ability of willing and choosing, which is called liberty of will, it is denying its existence. For if those consequences are all *known*, it argues they were all *certain*, and none of them avoidable.

Having, as I hope, to the reader's satisfaction, answered the objections in respect to the liberty of the will, I would again invite him back to our subject.

The immediate causes of sin are found in our natural constitutions, and the most *distant* of those *immediate* causes are the same as the most *distant* of the *immediate* causes of our *virtues;* but the most immediate causes of our virtues and our vices are extremely different. For instance, two men meet at an inn; both of them have families which are in want of bread; they have each fifty cents, which they have just taken for their days work. One says, to the other, come, sit down, and we will take some drink, for our comfort, after a hard day's labor. The other reflects in his mind, and says to himself, to let my children suffer, at home, gratify my company in what is indifferent to me, would be abominable, having no particular appetite for spirits; he, therefore, refuses, bids his companion good night, goes and purchases necessary pro-

visions for his family, and goes home. He has done as a virtuous honest husband ought to do. The other possesses a violent appetite for ardent spirits; the moment he comes where it is, his want of it overpowers his love and duty to his family, the latter object being at a distance, and the former being nigh; he calls for drink until he spends his fifty cents, and then goes home to his expecting family intoxicated. In this, according to the scriptures, though he were a professed christian, he is worse than an infidel.

In the mirror presented, the reader may see, that those two men acted equally alike from their natural wants, appetites and passions. Had neither of them any wants, appetites or passions, neither of them would have done any thing at all. They would not have labored for the money; and if they had the money, they would not have laid it out in *any* way possible. Therefore, we see, that want, appetite and passion, in one, produced *virtue*, and in the other *vice*. But, the still more immediate causes were not the same in both persons; and the consequence to them, in a moral sense, differ as much, as did the most immediate circumstances which produced their conduct. One felt the approbation of a good conscience in having done what cool dispassionate reason dictated; the other, as soon as his eyes are opened to see what he has done, is struck with condemnation, for having violated the dictates of that law of prudence and equity, of which he was susceptible.

A beggar influenced by hunger, calls at the door of the affluent for food, he knows it is there, his appetite is good, the *object magnifies* to his *senses*; but by one who knows the *love* of *property* more than *the want of food*, he is sternly denied. The beggar

votaries neither enter the kingdom of heaven themselves, nor suffer those to enter who would. All worship, which is dictated by modes and forms, as inventions of men, is opposed to the true worship. "The Father seeketh such to worship him, who worship him in *spirit* and in *truth*." Nothing suits the *carnal mind better than religion;* but it must be a child of her own, and must look just like herself. The carnal mind being the hot bed where all the roots of bitterness grow which trouble mankind, we ought to look there, for the foundation of all that religion which bears the features of the serpent. *Pride* is the most *prominent characteristic* of a fleshly mind, its religion dictates to look with contempt on those who are not of the same mode of faith, who do not subscribe to the same articles of belief, and are not called by the same denomination; and says, "Stand by thyself, come not nigh me, for I am holier than thou." It dictates to give thanks for not being like others; it boasts of performances wrought with great pains and expense; it boasts of having "borne the burden and heat of the day," and dictates to expect more than others receive: "But the carnal mind," says the reader, "makes no use of the scriptures, does it?" Always, besure, where it is fashionable to believe them, and men are *despised*, if they do not. Any thing will do, of which the creature is proud, and is willing to *persecute* others for not adopting. But ought not men to be despised, and called all to naught, who do not believe the bible to be the word of God? The Old Serpent will answer, yes, where it suits his turn best; but the spirit of Christ answers, no, in *all cases*. If the scriptures *be not the word of God*, men ought not to be *despised for* not believing them; and if they be,

benevolence. An American is travelling in Europe; he meets, in the street, a young and beautiful *fair, bathed in tears,* her *breast swollen with grief,* and her *countenance perfectly sad.* His heart, fraught with the *keenest sensibility* is moved compassionately to inquire the cause of her *grief;* he is informed that her father, in a late sickness, became indebted to his physician twenty guineas, for which he was that hour committed to gaol, when he had but partially recovered his health. Our traveller no sooner hears the story, than he advances the twenty guineas to discharge the debt, and gives her fifty more as a reward for her generous concern. As our traveller did not expect any *pecuniary reward,* either *directly* or *indirectly,* his *charity* is called *disinterested benevolence.* But, strickly speaking, he was greatly *interested;* he was *interested* in the afflictions of father and child; their relief was his object, and charity his passion. Now did he not act for his own happiness? Yes, as much as ever a man did in life. What must have been his misery, possessing the same disposition, without the means to relieve? And what a sublime satisfaction he enjoyed, by the bestowment of his favor! Sacred truth informs us, "It is more blessed to give, than to receive."

We find some men honest and industrions; who think, and think justly, that happiness is not to be found in any other way. Others are indolent and knavish, and they expect to obtain happiness in so being. But they are deceived in their objects; and will finally learn, that they must be, what conscience has often told them they ought to be, honest and just, in order to be happy.

The objector will say, to admit that our happiness, is the grand object of all we do, destroys the *purity of religion,* and reduces the whole to noth-

been *reddened* with the *gore* of the *slain;* and Sharks and Sea Dogs fed on the sons of mourning fathers and weeping mothers; while the leaders of this calamity make high professions of the religion of the meek and lowly Jesus, and are frequently sending out their proclamations for fasts, and for prayers to Almighty God, to assist them in human butchery! "From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not even from your lusts, which war against the soul?" It is recorded in the scriptures, that the *love* of money is the root of all evil. But men would have no love for money, were it not for the earthly advantages obtained by it. Then, the passion is covetousness, and the consequence is mischieyious to mankind. One, for the sake of money, will steal, another will lie, another counterfeit the currency, and another will murder. Were it not for the sake of property, would men do these things? Answer, no. Then, in relation to what I have before argued, I ask, would men be industrious, were it not for the sake of property? Answer, no; then the case is plain, that they both act from the same *main passion*, which is want, and to the same *main object*, which is happiness. But their minor objects and their minor passions vary. What need would there be of government, were it not for sin? If all were willing to do, as they would be done by, what an enormous expense would be saved; as it would render governmental laws useless. But by reason of men's passions, and mistaken objects influencing them, our lives are exposed to be taken by our neighbors, our property pillaged, our hard earnings wrung by violence away, and our midnight slumbers interrupted by banditti, and, in short, all that is dear *to us*, to be taken from our enjoyment.

"He, who loveth not his brother, is a murderer." Are not all men murderers? do they not sometimes experience the lack of brotherly love? This murderous passion is sin, it is opposed to the language of the heavenly man in the mind; but what are its consequences? Every one endeavors to supplant his brother; no one is safe, in his feelings, while he is in the hands of his brother. When this passion reigns, all the tender charities of humanity are suppressed; all the *bowels* of *compassion* are *frozen;* a deaf ear is turned to the *cries* and *calls* of the *needy* in *distress;* the poor are despised by the rich, the rich are envied by the poor; parents are dishonored by their children; children are abused, and provoked to anger by their parents. The vile affections of sin will burn to the destruction of the sweetest harmonies of nature; the *whitest robes of innocence* are *stained* with its *indelible crimson;* the soul is drowned in the *black waters* of *iniquity*, and the whole mind, with every faculty, is *plunged* into the *hell* of moral *death.*

Yet, listen to the worst of torments, in consequence of sin. "A wounded conscience, who can bear?" A *fire* that burns all the day long, a sword that continually pierceth the soul, a sting that cannot exhaust its poison, a fever that never turns till the patient dies. "*A dart struck through his liver.*" What ails the sinner? why his hand on his breast? There gnaws the worm that never dies, there burns the fire that is never quenched. A consciousness of guilt destroys all the *expected* comforts and pleasures of sin. How strange it is, that after a thousand disappointments in succession, men are not discouraged. O sin! how you paint your face; how you flatter us, poor mortals, on to death; *you never appear* to the sinner in your true char-

acter; you make us fair promises, but you never fulfilled one; your tongue is smoother than oil, but the poison of asps is under your lips; you have impregnated all our passions with the venom of your poison; you have spread gloomy darkness over the whole region of the soul; you have endeavored, with your stupefactive poison, to blunt the sword in the hands of the cherubims, which, for your sake, keeps us from the tree of life.

A mistaken idea has been entertained of sin, even by professors. I have often heard sincere ministers preach, in their reproofs to their hearers, that it was the greatest folly in the world, for people to forego salvation, in a future state, for the *comforts* and *pleasures* of *sin* in this. Such exhortations really defeat their intentions. The wish of the honest preacher is, that the wicked should repent of their sins, and do better; but, at the same time, he indicates, that sin, at present, is more productive of happiness than righteousness; but that the bad will come in another world; that although *doing well* is a *hard way*, yet, its advantages will be great, in another state. Just as much as any person thinks sin to be more happifying than righteousness, he is sinful; his heart esteems it, though, in some possible cases, for fear of the loss of salvation in the world to come, he may abstain from some outward enormities; yet, his heart is full of the desire of doing them. A thief passes a merchant's shop, wishes to steal some of his goods, but dare not, for fear of apprehension and punishment. Is this man less a *thief* at *heart*, for not actually taking the goods? I have been told, by persons of *high professions* in *christianity*, that if they were sure of salvation in the world to come, they would *commit every sin*, to which their unbridled

passions might lead them; even from the lips of some who *profess to preach the righteousness of Christ*, have I heard such-like expressions! I do not mention these things to cast reflections on any person or denomination in the world; for I have a favorable hope, that there are some, in all denominations, who are not so deceived; but I mention them in order to show how deceiving sin is, to the mind. It is as much the nature of sin, to torment the mind, as it is the nature of fire to burn our flesh. Sin deprives us of every rational enjoyment, so far as it captivates the mind; it was never able to furnish one drop of cordial for the soul; her tender mercies are cruelty, and her *breasts* of *consolation* are *gall* and *wormwood*. Sin is a false mirror, by which the sinner is deceived in every thing on which his mind contemplates. If he think of his Maker, who is his best friend, it strikes him with awe, fills his mind with fearful apprehensions, and he wishes there was no such being. If he think of any duty which he owes his Maker, he says, in a moment, God is a hard master, why should he require of me what is so contrary to my happiness? Religion is only calculated to make men miserable; righteousness blunts my passions, and deprives me of pleasures for which I long. But it represents stolen waters to be sweet, and bread eaten in secret to be pleasant. In a word, sin is of a torment-giving nature to every faculty of the soul, and is the moral death of the mind.

Well, says the reader, can sin have all those evil effects, and not be *infinite?* Undoubtedly; as all those evil effects are experienced in this finite state. Thousands, who, I hope, are gone to greater degrees of rest than the most upright enjoy here, *were once* tormented with sin, were once under

the dominion of the carnal mind. The effects of sin, as sin, are not endless, but limited to the state in which it is committed. This, perhaps, will be contrary to the opinion of many who read this treatise, as they are wont to suppose, that there are *three cardinal consequences* produced by sin, viz. *Death temporal, death spiritual,* and *death eternal.*

As to the first of these consequences, I think I have plainly refuted it. Men die natural deaths, because they are naturally mortal; but they are not mortal because of sin, for man was mortal before he sinned; if he were not, he never could have sinned. My opponent will say, that the death of the body is the consequence of sin, when one man murders another; to which I reply, one man could not murder another, if men were not mortal. Sin cannot be said to be the cause of natural death, any more than of natural life. I will acknowledge that sin is often the mean whereby natural life is ended, and my opposer must acknowledge, that it is often the mean of persons being introduced into natural life. Perhaps an hundred are introduced into existence by illicit connections, where one is taken out by malice prepense. But the meaning of the objector is, that man became mortal by sin; to which I reply, if immortality be corruptible by sin, the christian hope of immortality is a vain one. The death which Adam died, in consequence of sin, happened on the day of transgression, if we may believe the scripture account about it; but Adam did not die a natural death, on that day, nor for some hundreds of years afterwards.

The way in which many have tried to reconcile the scriptures with their traditions, in this matter, appears strange to me; they quote 2 Peter, iii. 8.

"But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day with the Lord, is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day; and as Adam died short of a thousand years, he died in the day of transgression. But, in order for the text to read to their meaning, it ought to read thus, "One day with the Lord *is* a thousand years, and a thousand years *is* one day;" as they understand the text, the conjunction *as* has no possible meaning. In respect to *spiritual death*, I believe it was all that was meant by the word, "*in* the *day* thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." But, if *eternal death* were also intended, there was no recovery for man. Why divines have carried this matter so erroneously beyond all scripture tenets, I cannot imagine. But, it is said, spiritual or moral death would be eternal, were it not for the dispensation of the gospel, by which death is swallowed up of life. So we might say of any thing else, even of a momentary nature; it would be eternal if it were never to end. The days of a man's life would be *eternal*, if they were never to end. The spring would be *eternal*, if it were not succeeded with the summer. A rose would be an eternal flower, if it never withered. And youth would be *eternal*, if it were not for old age and death. But what do all such arguments avail? The grand, sublime and glorious system of God, carries every thing away that has its birth from mortality and time.

I have already hinted, that sin might have consequences which were not evil, but not as sin. By the infinite wisdom and goodness of the Almighty, sin may be of advantage even to the sinner himself; but I say again, not as sin. If the infinitely *Wise and Good* intended any one thing for good, *which we rightly* call sin, that event, in respect to

the divine intention, is not sin. I have introduced a circumstance, in the fore part of this work, in which, what I am now endeavoring to illustrate, may clearly be seen. It is evident that, that which Joseph's brethren meant unto evil, God meant unto good. Now the immediate consequences of their sin, to them, was guilt of the first magnitude. Who could calculate the one half of what they endured, in consequence of the wrong which they had done? But the consequences which God intended, in the issue of the event, were altogether beneficial; and those who committed the sin, by the mercy of God, were made the partakers of the benefits contained in the purpose of him who meant it for good.

Again, it is evident from the scriptures, that Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together against Jesus, to do what the council and the hand of the Almighty had determined to be done. See Acts iv. 27, 28. Had Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, any better meaning, in crucifying Christ, than Joseph's brethren had in selling Joseph to the Ishmaelites? All who read the question, will answer, no. But the sacred text says, they were gathered together to do whatsoever *God's hand* and *council* had *determined* to be done. Now I ask, was not the determination of the murderers of Christ, the same, with the determination of Divine Wisdom? Says the reader, I cannot say it was not, and yet, I dare not say it was. I will then answer, the Almighty intended all they did, should be done; but he intended it for a very different purpose from what they did, who did it. They intended *the destruction* and *overthrow* of the doctrine *which Christ* preached, and they hoped to

things which he had spoken, concerning them, would fail of taking place. But the means which they used to oppose the cause of Christ, were those with which God intended to promote it. They missed of their intentions, and the Lord carried the whole of his into effect. What christian is there in the world, who will say, the consequences of the death of Christ are not good? or, that those who were his murderers, for whom he *prayed* on the *cross*, will not receive an advantage from his death, which they meant for evil? Or who can *limit* the good contained in the designs of the Almighty? But will this rule do, says the reader, to apply to all sin? I answer without hesitancy, that I fully believe it. Food for the body would never please the appetite, unless we first experienced hunger; the cooling spring would not be sought for, if men were never thirsty; health could never be prized, could we not contrast it with sickness; ease is appreciated, by the remembrance of pain; and a physician would never be wanted, if it were not for our infirmities; a Saviour would never have been praised, by his redeemed, had they never been in bondage; the song, "*Thou hast redeemed us to God*, out of *every kingdom* and *nation*," could never be sung, had redemption not been needed; a fountain would never have been opened, for Judah and Jerusalem to wash in, from sin and uncleanness, had it not been for sin and uncleanness. Then, says my opponent, we may do evil, that good may come. This objection has often been stated to me, in conversation on this subject. My reply is short. There is a self-contradiction in the objection; to do any thing whatever, *for good, is not* a moral transgression. Had Joseph's *brethren* been taught of God, that it was

necessary for them to sell Joseph to the Ishmaelites, that he might go down to Egypt, and there prepare for the famine, and they had done it, for the good which God intended, it would have been no more sin, in them, than there was in the *design* of God. Then it is plain, that to do evil that good may come, is impossible.

Again, had Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, intended the good which God intended, in the crucifixion of Christ, *sin* would have been out of the question. St. Paul asks the question to his opposers, after he had argued, that, *where sin abounded, grace* did *much more abound*, "Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?" And answers it thus, *God* forbid. How shall we, who are dead to sin, live any longer therein? If we are truly enlightened into the nature of the all-abounding grace of the gospel, it causes us to die to sin; and if we are *dead* to *sin*, we shall not *live* in it. God has forbidden it, in the nature of things, and rendered it impossible.

As I have limited sin in its nature, the reader will not expect to find unlimited consequences attached to it, in this work. Were it so, that the fulness of the divine law was perfectly comprehended in the mind of the creature, and he should do contrary thereto, his sin would then be as infinite as the law transgressed; but I argue, that the law transgressed, is a law formed in the mind of an imperfect being, by the imperfect knowledge which he obtains of the *divine law*, which is no [illegible]r than God himself. This knowledge being [illegible]erfect, forms a law like itself, imperfect and [illegible]ble; and an imperfect, mutable law does not [illegible] data, from which to argue endless conse[illegible]ces. The sacred oracle declares, "the son

that sins shall die:" If it had added and said, "and shall *never live again*," it would have carried the consequences of sin infinitely farther than the Holy Ghost intended. Sin is death to the soul, as long as it sins, be that time longer or shorter. In order to argue an endless consequence, we must first state an infinite cause; and as I have argued sin on a finite scale, and in a limited circle, I must rationally limit its consequences.

I will now state two particulars, which the reader will find argued in the course of this work, state my opponent's objections against them, answer those objections, and introduce my second general inquiry, by stating a third objection.

1st. Man is dependant in all his volitions, and moves by necessity.

2d. The Almighty has a *good intention*, in every volition of man.

Objection first. If man move by necessity, why do the scriptures abound with exhortations and admonitions to dissuade from sin, and so many inducements to persuade to holiness and virtue? And why are there requirements in the law, to which man is under the necessity of going contrary?

Objection second. If God have a good intention, in every action or volition of man, why is it said, in the scriptures, that he is grieved and provoked with us? &c.

The proposition, against which the first objection stands, answers the objection, in all its parts. It was in the system of divine wisdom, that man should experience a consciousness of sin and guilt, without which, the subject of my inquiry could never have existed. If sin and guilt had never been introduced into our system, the plan of grace,

by atonement, could never have been exhibited. Sin and guilt could never have existed, providing there had been no prohibition communicated to the intelligent mind; and, on the other hand, if the mind possessed as much liberty to go contrary to inducements, as it does inclination to follow them, inducements would have no possible effect; exhortations, admonitions, and warnings, would be of no possible service.

If God purposed that man should come to the knowledge of his own infirmities in the way that he does, he must have intended all the means whereby the purpose might be accomplished. And if he designed, that any degree of moral holiness should be found on earth, such inducements must influence the minds of men, which would necessarily produce it. That God does in a strict sense of speaking, require more of any of his creatures than they are able to perform, is inconsistent with the dictates of good reason, and destitute of scripture authority; and has no better foundation for its support, than an idea that darkness originates in the sun, or light in an opaque body. But does not God require perfect holiness of man? Does he not command strict obedience, to every jot and tittle of his law?

I have before argued, that the spirit of God's law, in its infinite fulness, was above the capacity of man in a finite state, in which he was made subject to vanity; and that it was the shadow of the law only that was introduced to the creature's understanding, and that for the purpose, that the offence might abound. Then, says my opponent, if I are correct, in this statement, does it not prove the requirement is more than the abilities of the

creature can perform? And how can the difficulty be removed?

The subject now in question, is a query, on which many religious disputes have arisen, and much difference of sentiments rested. Two grand parties, in Christendom, have been formed by it; and those two have subdivided, according to their different modes of solving those difficulties, to which they have been driven by their antagonists.

Some have contended, that in the beginning, man was possessed of sufficient ability to have kept the law of his Maker perfectly; but, that he lost that ability, by transgression; and, that neither Adam, nor his posterity, was ever able to retrieve it; but, although man has lost his ability to obey, God has not lost his right to command. This has appeared to many, to be sound argument.

Supposing Government had an occasion for raising an army, and should command a cripple to bear arms, and endure fatigue: The poor cripple desires consideration, on account of his infirmities, but is told, that his father crippled him, in infancy, which, if he had not done, he would now have been able to endure fatigue; but, as his father did him this piece of mischief, in his infancy, he must, and ought to comply with impossibilities, on pain of death! This has just the same appearance of *sound reason* as the other.

Others have endeavored to solve this matter, by placing a *total inability* in the *will* of the creature; arguing, that no ability is wanting but a willingness, &c. They admit at the same time, that the power of altering the will, does not belong to the creature. These argue, that this *inability* is *criminality*. I have already shown, that will is a *consequence arising* from our perceptions of objects

which proves, if our understanding were perfect, our will would be so. The criminality, therefore, might be placed on the understanding, as well as on the will. The reader will observe that I am speaking of criminality, which is supposed to be seen by the Allwise, in his creatures. It certainly cannot be *difficult* for the reader to see, that there is as much inability in the *understanding*, as there is in the *will*, when a man is so much deceived, as to think it more for his happiness to be dishonest, than to be governed by the principles of integrity.

Others say, Adam lost his ability to obey, by transgression, but that God restored it again, by the Mediator, and man possesses it now, as the gift of God, through Christ; and argue, that it is in the power of man to keep the law of God perfectly. If this be the case, it seems that it might as well have been otherwise, as there is not a just man on earth, who liveth and sinneth not. All who argue this idea, acknowledge that they have been sinners; and indeed, if they did not, they would have no part nor lot in the son of Jesse.

Let us now state fairly, this *gordian-knot*, and see if we can find a *truth* that will cut it. If it stand in a plain contradiction in words, it will the better expose its difficulties, and we shall the better know how to attack it. I will state it thus, God requires of man what he *cannot* perform; *all* that God requires of man, man *can* perform: And now for the *truth* that will *shine to illuminate so dark a place.* Observe, with attention; God's *holy, just* and *infinitely perfect law*, stands in the *eternal constitution* of the *heavenly man*, the *second Adam*, the *Lord* from *heaven;* it requires *perfect holiness* in *Christ* the *Mediator*, who is the *Lord*, our righteousness. And in him, we are able to fulfil all righteousness

and stand unaccused and uncondemned. I say more, we have never violated that perfect law of holiness, in the heavenly nature, but have fulfilled all it required. But we are *unable* to fulfil those divine requirements in our *carnal*, or *old man*. I have already hinted, that perfect wisdom and knowledge were necessary, in order to fulfil a perfect law. And it is in *Christ alone*, that we find all the *treasures of wisdom and knowledge;* in him, we possess every ability, to keep the law of God perfectly; but in the earthly Adam, we have not one single faculty, that is fit for so holy a service.

I may now venture to state more contradictions. I am a fool; and yet, I am wise. I am weak; and yet, I am strong. I am impure; and yet, I am pure. I am unholy; and yet, I am holy. I am condemned; and yet, I am justified. I am a vessel of dishonor; and yet, I am a vessel of glory. I am dead; and yet, I live. I have lost my life; and yet, I have gained it. I fell, in the field of battle; and yet, gained the victory. I am a perishable worm of the dust; and yet, an immortal spirit.

When the Lord gave the tables of the covenant to Moses, on the Mount, he went down to the children of Israel, found them worshipping the calf which Aaron had made, and being angry thereat, *broke* the *tables* which he had received. The Lord again called Moses to the Mount, and gave him other tables, and gave orders for them to be deposited in the ark of the covenant, where they were preserved. By this, we are taught the unsafety of the law, in our hands, in the earthly nature, and its safety in Christ, the heavenly.

I come to take notice of the second objection. *There are many* passages of scripture, which re-

present the Almighty as possessing irritable passions, like his creatures. We are told, that it repented him that he had made man on the earth, and that it *grieved* him at the *heart*. These expressions are as strong in their indications of *changeability*, as any that might be chosen. An apostle exhorts, not to *grieve* the *Holy Spirit*; and it is not unfrequent that *God* is *provoked* to *anger* and *jealousy*, according to scripture. My opponent will not argue, that we ought to understand those scriptures as *strictly* and *literally* true; no man, in his senses, can believe them so, and yet believe the Almighty unchangeable. Supposing my opponent should give his own opinion of this question; I have no doubt but he would remove the objection, to all intents. I understand those scriptures, as many others do, to be spoken according to the dark understanding of man, who is ignorant of the real character of God; and according to the representations made by the law to the unreconciled mind. To admit, in a *strict sense* of speaking, that *God* was ever *grieved* to the *heart*, for what he did himself, or for what his creatures do, is more than I can do, and believe in the perfections of a Supreme Being. St. James says, With God there is no *variableness* nor *shadow of turning*. This expression is as strong an indication of the *unchangeability* of the Almighty, as any that might be chosen. St. Paul informs us that God works *all things* after the council of his own will. Our being led by a *carnal* and *fleshly mind*, is undoubtedly what the apostle meant, by *grieving* the *Holy Spirit*; as the motions or vibrations of the carnal man are opposed to those of the heavenly; but that the eternal *Spirit* of God ever felt *grief*, is more than we can ra-

tionally admit, as that would reduce the Almighty to a state of suffering. It is very evident, that the scriptures represent the Almighty in extremely different characters; and I confess I cannot reconcile them in any other way, than by the two covenants, or what is the same, flesh and spirit. Our ideas of God, while under the legal dispensation, walking in fleshly minds, are consonant to that character which the scripture represents our Creator in, as wrathful, filled with indignation towards us for our sins, and every day angry. Those ideas which the mind entertains of the father of all mercies when enlightened by the spirit of the new man, and while walking in the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which maketh free from the law of sin, are altogether consonant to that endearing character given in scripture, of our *Father* who is in *heaven*, who causeth his sun to shine on the *evil* and on the *good;* and sendeth rain upon the *just*, and upon the *unjust;* who loved us *while we were yet enemies*, and sent his Son to die, in attestation of his love to his creatures; who is good unto all, and whose tender mercies are over all the works of his hands; who is of one mind, and changeth not.

Says my opponent, if the Almighty govern all the affairs of mankind, according to his own appointment; if he were never disappointed; suffers no violation of will; but does, in all things, and by all things, maintain and support his own eternal system of divine goodness, what room do we find, for the *necessity* of *atonement*, whereby *peace* is *made* by the *blood* of the *cross?*

By this question, I come to my second general *subject, viz.*

ATONEMENT FOR SIN.

In my enquiries on this momentous subject, I shall, First, examine three doctrinal tenets on atonement; from which, I shall beg leave to dissent, and give my reasons therefor.

Secondly, Show the necessity of atonement, and where satisfaction must be made.

Thirdly, Inquire into the personage and character of the Mediator, who makes the atonement, and his ability to perform the work.

Fourthly, Of atonement in its nature.

Christian divines, in general, have agreed in supposing sin to be an *infinite evil*, being a violation of an *infinite law*, and, therefore, that the law required an *infinite sacrifice;* short of which no atonement could be made; that the transgression of Adam brought the whole human race into the same situation of sin and misery, and subjected them all to the *infinite penalty* of an *infinite law*, which they had violated in their parent, before they individually existed.

After the above agreement, many different roads are taken; and divines of the greatest abilities, and of the first rank among the literati, have drained the last faculty of invention, in plodding through the dark regions of metaphysics, to bring up a *Samuel* to explain the *solecism* of *satisfying* an *infinite dissatisfaction.*

The plan of redemption, as held by many, may be reduced to the following compendium. God, from all eternity, foreseeing that man would sin, provided a Mediator for a certain part of his posterity, who should suffer the penalty of the law for them, and that these elect ones, chosen by God from *the rest of* mankind, will alone be benefitted by the *atonement;* that, in order that the sacrifi

might be adequate to the crime, for which, the sinner was condemned to *everlasting*, or endless suffering, God himself, assumed a body of flesh and blood, such as the delinquent was constituted in, and suffered the penalty of the law by death, and arose from the dead. By this process, the demand of the law was completely answered, and the debt due to Divine Justice, by the elect, was fully and amply paid. But that this atonement does not affect those who were not elected as objects of mercy, but that they are left, to suffer *endlessly* for what Adam did, before they were born. It is true, they are a little cautious about saying, that *God himself absolutely died!* But they say, that Christ, who was crucified, was *really God himself*, which must, in effect, amount to the same thing. And in fact, if the Infinite did not suffer death, the whole plan falls, for it is by an *infinite sacrifice* that they pretend to *satisfy* an *infinite dissatisfaction*.

Why the above ideas should ever have been imbibed, by men of understanding and study, I can but scarcely satisfy myself; their absurdities are so glaring, that it seems next to impossible, that men of sobriety and sound judgment should ever imbibe them, or avoid seeing them.

I have already sufficiently refuted the idea of an infinite sin, which opens to a plain path, in which the mind may run, and run clear of all those perplexities which have served to confuse, rather than enlighten mankind.

If sin be not infinite, the dissatisfaction occasioned by sin is not infinite, therefore an infinite *sacrifice* is not required. But, for the sake of illustration, we will for a moment admit, that the doctrine of atonement stands on the ground over

which we have just gone. I will state it as it is often stated by those who believe it, which is by the likeness of debt and credit. The sinner owed a debt to Divine Justice, which he was unable to discharge; the Divine Being cannot, consistently with his honor, dispense with the pay, but says, I must have what is my due; but as the debtor has not ability to pay the smallest fraction, Divine Wisdom lays a deep concerted mysterious plan for the debt to be discharged. And how was it? Why, for God to pay it himself!

My neighbor owes me a hundred pounds; time of payment comes, and I make a demand for my dues. Says my neighbor, my misfortunes have been such, that I am not the possessor of the smallest fraction of property in the world; and as much as I owe you I am worse than nothing. I declare to him, positively, that I will not lose so much as a fraction of the interest, and leave him. A friend calls, and asks me how I succeeded in obtaining my dues of my neighbor; I reply, my neighbor is not, nor will he ever be able to pay me any part of my demand. My friend says, he is sorry that I should lose my debt. I answer, I shall not lose it. I have very fortunately, in my meditations on the subject, thought of a method, by which I can avail myself of the whole, to my full satisfaction; and I think it is a method which no person in the world, but myself, could ever have discovered. My friend is curious, and impatient to know the mighty secret, never before found out. The reader may guess his confusion, on my telling him, that, as I have that sum already by me, I am now going to pay up the obligation, before the interest grows *any larger! This* has been called the gospel plan, *which contains* the depths of infinite wisdom

I should be pleased to see, what I have never seen, professors following such example in obtaining what the poor widow, the fatherless, and the needy, owe them. But, says the advocate for the plan, a *distinction* ought to be made, *between* the *persons* in the Godhead. It was the second person in the Godhead, who paid this infinite debt, to the first; therefore, it is not altogether like a person paying his own demand. I say, in answer, if the first and second persons in the Godhead are not so essentially one as to make the debts due to one belong equally to the other, and payment also, they are not so essentially one, as to be represented by two distinct persons, related only by Adam, who are in co. in merchandise. But, for the sake of carrying the argument still further, I will admit this *variety* of persons in an *infinite, indivisible being!* And also the plan of atonement on the principle of the second person's paying the demand to the first. And here it will be necessary to introduce the *third person* in the Godhead, as it is contended that the third person makes known to the debtor, what the creditor determines concerning him. Then the plan of the doctrine may be represented by the following similitude: A owes B the sum of one thousand pounds; the time of payment comes, demand is made; A is not worth a farthing, neither is it in his power to raise a fraction of the money. B immediately commences a process against A, of which, C, a friend of A's, being informed, goes to B, asks him how large a demand he holds against A; B informs him, a thousand pounds, and the interest. And is A worth nothing? asks C. Nothing, answers B. Would you make a deduction of twenty-five per cent, if you *could have the* money down? asks C. Not the

least deduction, answers B. You will, at least, throw in the interest, says C. Not the smallest fraction, answers B. Well, says C, if you have no *mercy* on the *poor* and *distressed*, I will have the *pleasure* of *relieving* the *debtor alone;* counts out the money in full, and receives the obligation to bestow on his friend, A. B sends a servant immediately to inform A, that he has concluded to forgive him the debt. A is transported at the news, flies to tell his wife and children the tidings of mercy, and all join in praising such heavenly benevolence. C comes in, the same moment, with the obligation in his hand; modestly gives it to A, desiring him to accept it as a token of undissembled friendship. A is *confounded*, asks C how he came by the obligation; C informs him, that he paid every farthing of the money for it, the creditor would not make the least deduction. I leave the reader to judge, whether the creditor showed any mercy to the debtor, and whether B's pretensions of favoring A, do not wear the appearance of hypocrisy. It is contended by those who hold to this debt, and the payment of it, that the salvation of the sinner is by being forgiven; yet, they contend, that the debt is paid. But how I can forgive a man a debt, and oblige him to pay it, is more than I can see.

Again, admitting the system true, I wish to inquire into the propriety of an innocent person's suffering, for one who is guilty. It is scripture, reason, and good law, never to condemn the innocent, in order to exculpate the delinquent. Supposing a foreign court sends a person, who is old in conspiracies and blood, to America, to lay a deep concerted plan to murder the President of the union, and a number of the first officers in the

federal government, for purposes mischievous to our political existence; and he should so far succeed, as to engage a number in this wicked design, and finally makes the attempt; his plans are discovered by government, and detected, but not until numbers have fallen a sacrifice to his mischievous endeavors. The leader of these seditious murderers, is taken and condemned to be executed; and the voice of every friend of justice and equity is against the criminal. But what would be the consternation of the good people of the United States, on being informed, that the good president of the union, the man whom the people delighted to honor, was executed, in the room of this seditious person, and the wicked murderer set at liberty? Is it possible to conceive that there is a single person in the world, who would call this a just execution? If it be said, that the president freely offered himself in the room of the criminal, it alters not the case, in the eye of justice. If an innocent man can justly be put to death, because he consents to it willingly, a guilty one may be acquitted because he prefers it. But it is further agreed that the authority had power to raise the president from the dead, which done, renders the work just and glorious. I say, in answer, that if the authority had this power, it might as well have executed the real criminal, and raised him from the dead, as to perform this work on one who was not guilty. What is the most shocking of any thing, in this system of atonement, is, the partiality represented in the Almighty; for admitting the plan rational, as it respects those circumstances, in which I have shown its absurdity, what can we find in scripture, or reason, that justifies such infinite partiality in our Creator? or what can, in the

least, serve as evidence to prove him possessed of it? Have we not reason to believe our Creator possessed of as much goodness as he has communicated to us? Can we rationally believe, that he is wanting, in those principles of goodness which he has placed in our understandings? When he saw the whole progeny of Adam in the same situation, by reason of sin, one no more guilty than another, why should he propose a plan of mercy for some few of them, and disregard the awful circumstances of the rest? the sacred oracle declares God to be no respecter of persons; if this be true, he is not a partial being. Jesus taught the character of God to his disciples, by turning their attention to nature, observing the equal distribution of rain and sunshine, on the evil and on the good, on the just and on the unjust. Supposing Joseph had dealt out bread plentifully to two of his brethren in Egypt, and had starved the rest to death, would it have looked like impartiality? It is argued, that none of them deserved a crumb from Joseph, whom they had sold; and if he pleased to give to one, and not to another, he had a right so to do. Then I say, he had a right to be partial. I am travelling through a large and extensive wood, and many miles from any inhabitants; I find ten persons who are lost; they have been out of provisions for several days; and having fatigued themselves, in wandering from hill to hill, from stream to stream, striving, to the utmost of their abilities, to find inhabitants; having given up all hopes of ever seeing their homes again, and having, in their minds, bid their wives and children a long farewell, they are waiting for hunger to do its last work! The moment I discover myself to them, with large supplies of *wholesome* and rich provisions, every

eye glistens with unexpected joy; the current of life starts afresh in their veins, and they all advance to meet me on their enfeebled hands and knees, with eagerness to receive the staff of life! I hasten to improve the opportunity of showing my sovereignty and goodness; I feed five of them to the full, the other five, I neglect. They beg for the smallest crust, which I do not want, but to no effect. Those whom I feed solicit me, every mouthful they eat, to bestow some on their fellow sufferers, but I refuse. I tell them, however, not to construe my conduct into *partiality*, but to learn my *power* and *sovereignty* by it. The five whom I have fed, I assist out of the wood, and leave the rest to their wants. My *conduct*, in the above affair, appears so much *blacker* than my *paper* is *white*, I choose rather to leave the reader to make his comments, than to write my own.

I enquire still further, did the Almighty know, before he made man, that he would become a sinner? Did he know that he would deserve an endless punishment? If the answer be in the negative, it supposes God to be wanting in knowledge, and that he created beings at an infinite risk, as he did not know what would be the consequences. If the question be answered in the positive, it proves that an infinite cruelty existed in God; for unless that was the case, he would never have created beings, who, he knew, would be infinitely the losers by their existence.

Those who believe in the system which I am examining, believe in the existence of the Devil, whose existence I have refuted in this work. I am willing, however, for the sake of the argument, to admit the existence of their God, and Devil likewise. But wish to inquire, which of them is, in

reality, the worst being. God, when he created mankind, perfectly knew that some of them would suffer endless torment, for their sins; he must, therefore, have intended them for that purpose. For, it is inconsistent to suppose, that the Almighty would create, without a purpose; and his purpose could not be contrary to his knowledge. The matter then stands thus, God created millions of beings for endless misery, which they could not escape; the Devil is desirous of having them miserable, and does all in his power to effect it. Now, reader, judge between these two beings. Had this Devil been consulted, by the Almighty, when he laid the plan of man's final destiny, I cannot conceive him capable of inventing one more eligible to his infernal disposition, than this which I am now disputing.

As reason will not consent to the plan of God, as described in the foregoing scheme, I will show that the scriptures equally oppose it. It is granted, that Jesus Christ died for mankind, as the scriptures declare; but not in the way, in which thousands have believed. But supposing he died instead of the sinner, in the way which I dispute, I still wish to prove, that he died for the whole of Adam's posterity, as much as he did for any. If Isaiah did not believe that, that would be the case, I cannot reconcile his words to his opinion, which I find in chap. liii. ver. 5, 6. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. *All* we, like sheep, have gone astray: We have turned *every one* to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on *him the iniquity* of us ALL." St. Paul *have been of this* opinion, when he wrote

Timothy or his words are not expressive of his belief. See 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time." 1 Epistle General of John ii. 1, 2. "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not, and if *any* man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the *whole world.*" Hebrews ii. 9. "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, now crowned with glory and honor; that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for *every* man." The above scriptures, with their connexions and corresponding passages, as fully prove that Christ died for ALL men, as any one thing can be proved from the bible. Now, as there is not, in all the scripture, a single hint to the reverse of these passages which I have introduced, it appears strange and unaccountable to me, that any person, who professes to believe the testimony of the bible, should ever have entertained the idea, that what these passages say, is false, and that which is not said, in contradiction to what is, is true!

Look, ye readers, and submit to astonishment, at what has been believed in, as divine truth. An almighty, infinitely wise and good being, creates an innumerable multitude of rational intelligences; they rebel against him, and raise an infinite dissatisfaction in his mind toward them; this infinite dissatisfaction gets removed toward part of the offenders, by the sacrifice of innocence! With the rest, God is still displeased; yet, he is almighty *and infinitely* wise, and employs his power and

wisdom to make the works of his own hand as miserable as their natures will bear, for being just such creatures as he knew they would be, before he made them. But it is argued, that God's knowing what sort of creatures men would be, did not influence them in the smallest degree, to be what they are. Let this argument be granted. But did not God know what would influence men to be what they are? Answer, yes. Was it in his power to remove this influential cause? If it were, why did he not do it, if it were like to displease him? If it were not in his power to prevent the mischief, I wish to know whether it were in the creature's power to prevent it? If it were not in the power of either of them to prevent the operation of things in the way in which they have, and do take place, why is God's anger so warm against his poor impotent offspring? It seems an unhappy circumstance, for both Creator and creature. The Creator is not satisfied with his creatures; his creatures find themselves introduced into an existence infinitely worse than none. I am born into this world of sorrow and trouble; the first vibration of sense is want; I endeavor to supply my wants, and to maintain my existence, which my Maker has bestowed upon me; but as soon as I come to years of understanding, I am told of an *infinite debt* which stands against me, which I owed thousands of years before I was born; and that my Maker is so angry with me, and has been, ever since the debt was due, that he has prepared a furnace of endless flames to torment me in, according to the due requirements of justice! My father gives me his farm, and puts me in possession of it; I am pleased, and prize it very highly. In consequence of my possession, I paint to myself

many pleasing prospects; but, to my mortification, a person comes and presents me with a mortgage of my farm, for five times its value, the mortgage running so as to hold the possessor to clear it; I will leave the reader to say, whether my father was kind, or unkind. Yet, the circumstance into which the Almighty has introduced millions of his creatures, is infinitely worse, according to the doctrine which I am examining. It is argued, with much assurance, that God has a just right to do with his creatures as he pleases, because he has it in his power so to do; and that he never does any thing, because it is right; but what he does, is right, because he does it.

If the above statement be just, moral holiness consists in the power of action, and not in the disposition that designs the action. If so, my argument in favor of sin's existing only in the design of the actor, and not in the action, is groundless; and we are driven to say, that unholiness, or sin, is the *want* of power to perform an action; and holiness consists in having the power to do it. One man designs to murder another for his money, he makes the attempt, and fails; his sin consisted in not having power to execute his design; but, in the design, there is no evil. On the other hand, he makes the attempt, and succeeds; here is no evil at all, because he had power to do it. On this principle, every thing that can be done, is moral holiness; and every thing that cannot be done, is sin, or moral evil.

Here we are presented with a picture the most to be dreaded, of any thing which the imagination of man is capable of inventing. Power moving on in front, exhibiting tyrannic majesty in every *action; and meagre* justice in the rear, obsequi-

ously pronouncing all right! If these things be so, our senses are nothing but mediums of deception; and all our experience has served us no other purpose, than to make us more ignorant. Who is there in the world, possessing common sense, that does not dread and revolt from power, in every instance, where they see it connected with an evil disposition? Are we right, in wishing our enemies weak? We are, and that because their strength being directed by their wicked designs, gives us fear.

But, for the sake of the argument still further, let it be granted, that God being supreme, had a right to do, because he had the power. And he creates millions of beings, whom he intends for endless torments, and puts his whole design into execution; and this is called supreme goodness. Now I wish to know how a supreme evil could be described? All will grant, that evil is in opposition to good; then an opposite description would be just. To create, with an intention to make eternally happy, and to put that design into execution, would be supreme evil! But, according to the doctrine which I am examining, God contains these two characters in himself, having created some for one purpose, and some for the other. It will be of no advantage to the reader to have the absurdity of the above proposition any more exposed; than enough to have it rejected. I never heard or read any argument to prove the propriety of the disputed proposition. It is a begged proposition, and stands without the least shadow of evidence from scripture or reason; but it requires no great ingenuity to see what the chimera was invented for; without it, the whole plan and scheme of atonement, which I am now examining, would fall, for want of *foundation*.

There are some of Paul's writings to the Romans, which have been used by divines, to prove the partial plan of salvation true, of which, I think it will be proper to take notice, in this place. Romans ix. 21, 22, has been made great use of, in order to prove, that God made some men vessels of eternal dishonor, and others vessels of eternal glory. The words read as follow: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." In order that the reader may see, that the passage has not the meaning which has been generally attached to it, let him observe, that the two vessels, mentioned in the text, are made of the SAME LUMP; which also may be seen in God's communication to Jeremiah, see Jeremiah, xviii. 3, 4. "Then I went down to the potter's house, and behold he wrought a work on the wheels, and the vessel that he made of clay, was marred in the hand of the potter, so he made it again another vessel, as it seemed good to the potter to make it." Observe, the first vessel being marred was dishonorable, and it marred IN the potter's hand. The potter did not make the vessel perfectly sound and good, and lay it away whole, and the vessel mar itself afterwards; but it marred, while *in* the *hand* of the *potter*. The potter did not condemn the clay as good for nothing, because it marred; he did not cast it away and take other clay, to make another vessel; but, of the same clay, made a vessel as it seemed good unto *him to make it*. This vessel not being marred, *was a vessel of* honor. Here the reader may see

the power of God manifested, in making, of the same lump, a vessel of honor, and a vessel of dishonor.

The thread of the apostle's discourse to the Romans, in which he introduced the passage above written, was intended to show the distinction between law and gospel, or flesh and spirit; by turning to the eighth chapter, the reader will find himself assisted in the introduction of this particular. We then say, that as man stands in the earthly Adam, he is a marred vessel. Christ himself, when for us he was made a sin offering, in the fleshly nature, was "more marred than any man, and his form than the sons of men." But in his resurrection, he was a vessel of honor and immortal glory; "and as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall, also, bear the image of the heavenly." Further, see the two vessels described in 1 Cor. xv. 42. "*It* is sown in *corruption*, *it* is raised in *incorruption*; *it* is sown in *dishonor*, *it* is raised in *glory*; *it* is sown in *weaknes*; *it* is raised in *power*; *it* is sown a *natural* body, *it* is raised a *spiritual* body." Again, Romans xi. 7. &c. "What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded (according as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear) unto this day. And David saith, let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling block, and a recompense unto them; let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway."

On this passage, and others like it, is built the *doctrine of limited* salvation, by Jesus Christ, according to the *fore*-knowledge and predestinatio

of the Almighty. It is argued, that those who are here called the elect, are those for whom Christ died, and those alone who will finally obtain salvation by him. But why any person should make such a mistake, in reading this chapter, I am at a loss. The salvation of the elect is not argued, in this chapter; but the certainty of the salvation of those who were blinded, and the propriety of believing it, occupies the greatest part of it. Observe the words next to those I have quoted above, verse 11, &c. "I say then, have they stumbled, that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, to provoke them unto jealousy. Now, if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them, the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness?" Again, verse 15th, "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" Again, in his argument to the Romans, he endeavors to show them, by the similitude of the branches of olive trees, that they ought to believe that those blinded ones, though broken off through unbelief, would be graffed in again. See verse 24, "For, if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert graffed contrary to nature, into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be graffed into their own olive tree?" The apostle seems desirous to instruct the Roman church, and argues the point fervently; see verses 25, 26. "For I would not brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, *(lest ye should be wise in your own conceits,)* that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until *the fulness of the Gentiles* be come in. And so

all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall *turn away ungodliness* from Jacob." Compare the last verse which I have quoted, with Levit. xxvi. 44, 45. "And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my covenant with them: for I am the Lord their God. But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt, in the sight of the heathen that I might be their God: I am the Lord." And Isaiah xlv. 25. "In the Lord shall *all* the seed of Israel be *justified*, and shall *glory*." Many like passages might be quoted, from various parts of the scripture; but, perhaps, the above will suffice for this particular purpose. More, of the like nature, will be noticed in the sequel of this work.

The scriptures have been as much violated, to maintain the doctrine which I am examining, as good reason is, by supposing God to be so infinitely partial, as he must be, in the eye of reason, in order to be what the doctrine represents him.

I shall now invite the attention of the reader to another system of atonement, which was undoubtedly formed, with a view to shun the absurdities in the former, and to get rid of some of the consequences that were naturally deducible from that idea of the sufferings of Christ. This system supposes, that the atonement by Christ was not intended for the salvation of any part of the human race; that its main end, and sole object, was the glory of the Supreme Being, as manifested in his holy and righteous law. In support of this plan, it is argued, that it is inconsistent, for

infinite wisdom and goodness to prefer an inferior object to a superior one; that all creation, when compared with the Creator, sinks into nothing, bearing no possible proportion to the infinite Jehovah; of course, that God always has his own glory in view, as his supreme object, in all he does.

This plan agrees with the former, in supposing sin to be of infinite magnitude, and deserving of endless punishment; that, as the law of God is infinite, like himself, finite man is infinitely to blame for not fulfilling all its requirements; and that the penalty of the law is endless misery, which misery Christ sustained; not with a view of acquitting the sinner, nor in room and stead of the transgressor, as is supposed in the other plan; but for the honor of divine justice, and the glory of his Father. It is further argued, that by Christ's suffering the penalty of the law, justice is as fully satisfied, as if all mankind had been made miserable for an eternity. And this being the case, it is now just and right for God to acquit as many of the sinful race of Adam, as is consistent with his grand object, which is himself; yet, by no means rendering it unjust for God to punish, to all eternity, as many as is necessary, in order for the satisfying of the same grand object.

I first inquire into the propriety of the argument, on which this plan of atonement seems to be founded; which is, that god always acts for his own infinite and incomprehensible glory; never stooping so low, as to act with an intention for the good of his creatures.

1st. I ask, is God as infinitely glorious as he *can be, or not?* If it be answered, that he is; *then, if his object* in all he does, is to augment

his own glory, he never has, nor will he ever accomplish his intention. If it be argued, that it is not to augment his own glory, but to secure it and maintain it in its proper splendor, it argues it to be of a perishable nature, and that it would decay, were it not for the continual vigilance of the Almighty, in preserving it. If it be argued, that neither of these objects is right, but that it is the manifestation of his glory to intelligent beings, which is the grand design or object of God, in all his acts, without any reference to the effect which this manifestation has on those to whom it is made, I say, the object has now dwindled into annihilation; there is not the smallest imaginable atom of it left. To suppose, that any rational being can wish, or desire, to accomplish any piece of labor, without having any reference to the consequences, is too glaringly absurd, to need refutation. Now the nature of the proposition, which I am examining, confines the motive of Deity within himself, and himself from his creation. In order therefore, to look at the Almighty as he is by this doctrine represented, we must look at him as destitute of a creation, and view him abstractly from all his creatures. But may I ask, what title to give that being of whom we speak? The name *Jehovah*, truly has reference to his self-existence, and to his character as the giver of existence also. The name *God*, implies a being who is worshipped. *Lord*, signifies a possessor. *I am that I am*, has reference to an unchangeable being, but does not determine a being of goodness. I ask, again, what do we know of an Almighty, only by his works? If his existence can ever be determined, by any other means, I am ignorant of the way. What do we know, but by our sen-

ses? Have we any sense of good, or evil, that does not concern created beings? We may say, if we please, that God acts for his own essential good, abstractly from his creation; but what do we mean by it? An action, for the good of any being, presupposes that being in want; and if in want, then not infinitely happy. If God be not infinitely happy he never can be. I inquire further, by what data, can we determine that God is a good being? Can we determine it by any other criterion, than by the effects of what he does, as it concerns his creatures? The truth undoubtedly is, that just as far as we can look into creation, providence and redemption, and see the harmony and beauty of them, and see that all were calculated for the good of created intelligences, whom these things concern, we are satisfied, that he, who conducts the whole, is a good being. And if we say he is *good*, without this understanding, we acknowledge a proposition, for which, we are unable to adduce the smallest reason. Again, is it not wrong to make a separation, where the Almighty does not? Is he not perfectly joined to his creation? Do we not live, move, and have our being in God? Were we not created *of his fullness?* Had Deity any thing of which to create beings but his own eternal nature? I know it has been said, that God created *all things* out of *nothing*, &c.; but such an idea never will be imbibed by me, until I can form, in imagination at least, a notion, of how much *nothing* it takes to make the least imaginable *something*. If all things were created of the infinite Jehovah, as great a part of his creation as we take from him, so great a proportion we take from his fulness. God never could be more than infinite, in his fulness; then,

to take the smallest creature from him, which he created *of* that infinite fulness, you have left something less than infinity. Now, if it be argued, that God acts for the good of himself, considering his creatures to belong to his fulness, I am perfectly agreed: But, to say, that the Almighty has, or ever could have a motive, in action, that did not embrace every consequence that could arise from what he did, would be limiting his omnisciency; or, to say, that he did not intend good, to all whom his acts concern, would be limiting his goodness, and an impeachment on his justice.

I have before, in this work, contended, that all the attributes, which we ascribe to God, we call *good*, on account of the advantages which we derive from such principles. We are told of a God who acts for his own benefit, abstractly from his creation; and that, in millions of cases, he finds it most for his glory to make his rational, hoping, wanting creatures endlessly miserable; and this is called *goodness*. We are likewise told of a devil, who acts for his own gratification, and who delights in making God's creatures miserable; and this is called *badness*. But, for my part, according to such statements, the difference between goodness and badness, is so small, I can hardly distinguish it. It is profane, in my opinion, to attribute a disposition to the Almighty, which we can justly condemn in ourselves. A man, who should act from such a selfish principle as is attributed to God, would render himself wholly unworthy of the protection of common law. And shall we thus represent our kind and merciful Father, from whom ten thousand streams of goodness continually flow to his wanting and needy creatures? No; let every vibration of sense within us acknowledge his bountiful hand, *which is never closed.*

I have already labored, in this work, to show, that *sin* is *finite*, and not committed against an *infinite law*. I shall, however, now call into examination a subject something like it, which is, that of penalty; as it is contended, that the penalty of God's law is endless punishment, &c.

I first inquire, why does a legislature affix penalties to laws which it makes? Answer, the first reason is, the strength and security of government. 2d. That the punishment may serve to reclaim the delinquent. 3d. That the punishment of a criminal may serve to deter others from the commission of like crimes. 4th. In many cases, to keep the delinquent, by confinement or death, from doing any more mischief.

Now let us look into the government of an Almighty Being, and see how the matter of *penalty* will operate there. Observe the penalty is *endless misery*. I ask, is this necessary, to secure the government of an Almighty Being? Would his government be in danger, if this penalty were not enacted to his law? Supposing a legislature of men had the power in their hands, of causing all the community, on whom its laws were binding, to love their laws, in every requirement, and with vigilance to attend to the faithful discharge of their duties in all things, would it be necessary for them to enact penalties to their laws? Allowing the legislature to have such power, who, in the world, would say, it is not best to exercise it; that it is better to have penal laws, and let the people have their wicked obdurate hearts, so that now and then we may have a poor criminal to execute? I can hardly believe, that any will contend, that *penalty is necessary* in the *law* of *God*, in order to *secure his* government. Is there any scruple respect-

ing God's power to turn the hearts of his creatures as he pleases? If there be not, then there is no need of a penalty in his law, in order for the security of his government.

2d. Is this penalty necessary, in order to reclaim the delinquent? Answer, that is impossible. The *penalty* being *endless punishment*, it can have *no object in reclaiming the punished.* The execution of such a penalty on any of God's creatures, would prove the contractedness of his goodness, as no *possible good* could be communicated to a *victim* of such *punishment.* Divine truth says, *God* is *good* unto *all*, and his *tender mercies are over all the works of his hands.* To say, God is good to a creature of his, whom he irrevocably dooms to endless torments, is a violation of our senses; and no person, in a moment of sobriety, will believe it. It is then evident, that such a penalty would not be necessary to reclaim the sinner.

3d. Is it necessary to inflict such a penalty on the transgressor, in order to deter others from the commission of sin? Answer, no; for, according to the doctrine which I am examining, the first transgression committed, involved the whole human race in the delinquency; and an execution of such a penalty, would be the endless misery of the whole family of man; there would not have been one left to be deterred from sinning, or even to tell the news!

4th. Is such a penalty necessary, in order to keep the sinner from sinning any more? So far from that, this penalty would fix the delinquents in a situation, in which they could do nothing but sin, [illegible] endless eternity. No moral being can be [illegible]able as *suffering conscious* gilt, without sin: [illegible]fore, *in order* for endless misery to be inflic[illegible] [illegible]*dless transgression* is necessary.

Look, kind reader, and see what an absurdity lies here. Because a being has sinned once, the law which he violated requires that he should continue in transgression! Well, he complies; will the law justify him? But, says the reader, I do not understand you. Why, the matter is plain; if a moral being cannot be miserable, without sin, he must continue in sin, in order to be miserable. Then, if God's law requires endless misery, it requires endless transgression! But, it is argued, that a *law* cannot *exist* without a penalty. This, undoubtedly is an error. The *largest signification* of the word *law*, is *governing power*. See Rom. vii. 23. "But I see another *law* in my members, warring against the *law* of my mind, and bringing me into captivity unto the *law* of *sin*, which is in my members." This *law* of *sin* in the members, which brings the man into captivity, is undoubtedly the power of the flesh, which lusteth against the spirit, that we cannot do the things we would. Now, I ask, is there any penalty to this law? Does this *law* administer any condemnation to those who do not obey it? Most surely it does not. Then pass to the eighth chapter and third verse; "For the *law* of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." This *law* is undoubtedly the *governing* power of the heavenly nature, which overcomes the carnal mind, and delivers the soul from the bondage of sin. I ask, again, is there any penalty to this law? Is there a dispensation of condemnation administered by this law of life? Truth says, the wages of sin is death. Does this death flow from the *law* of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus? Surely not. "To be carnally minded is death." If carnal mindedness be that *death*, which is the wages of sin, surely it does not

flow from the spirit of life; "To be spiritually minded is life and peace."

God's moral law is like himself, *love;* "God is *love*, and he who loveth, dwelleth in God, and God in him." It requires all moral beings to love God and each other; and the reason why it commands this, is, it is love itself. True that soul is miserable that does not love God, and the reasons are, *love* is the life and happiness of the soul, and *hatred* is its death and misery.

Although I think I have given unanswerable reasons, why I do not admit such a penalty as I have examined, I will for the sake of the argument still further, allow it, and inquire into Christ's suffering it.

To say, that Christ *has suffered* such a penalty is a contradiction in terms, because an endless duration has not, yet, expired. To say, that this penalty ever will be *suffered*, by Christ, or any other being, is another contradiction in words; for an endless duration will never expire. Then to say, that such a penalty has been, or ever will be suffered, is erroneous.

If it be argued, that Christ was an *infinite* person, and, therefore, could suffer an endless punishment, in a few moments; I answer, it is not shunning the contradiction. If the position be moved, and the argument is, that he being *infinite*, could suffer as much, in a few moments, as *all* mankind would to an endless duration; I ask, are there more *infinite* beings than one? All answer, no. I ask, again, is it possible for that infinite being to suffer? Even from my opponent, the answer will be, that the infinite himself did not suffer; but that it was the finite nature which suffered, and was raised from he dead, by the infinite; that it was

the *human nature* which was made a sin offering; and that the divine nature gave victory to the human, by raising it into an immortal life. Well then, the sufferings were *finite*, and could by no means answer the requirements of an *infinite* penalty.

The particular difference, between this plan and the former, is in the *intentions* of the *sufferings* of *Christ*. The former supposes, that Christ suffered, in room and stead of the sinner, so as to acquit all those from condemnation, for whom he died: This argues, that the intention of the sufferings of Christ was not the salvation of sinners; but, as I have before observed, the *glory* of the Supreme being. But, that by the sufferings of Christ, the law is perfectly magnified, and made honorable; and that it is just, for God to acquit as many of the sinful race of Adam, as is consistent with his glory; but does not render it unjust, for him to punish, endlessly, as many as is necessary for the same grand object.

Now, admitting the penalty of the law to be endless, and that Christ suffered it in full, the *law* cannot now require the destruction of the offender; how then can we reasonably argue, that it is for the *glory* of God to punish, when justice does not require it? If justice do require it now, of *any*, it does of *all*. If it be argued, that divine justice does not require the endless happiness or misery of man, I say, it is not a law which concerns mankind; and if we say, God's will, in the misery of mankind, extends farther than the requirements of his justice, it is setting the Almighty against himself. Again, admitting such provisions to be made, as render it consistent with justice, that all sinners should be emancipated from death and misery, does eternal love and mercy require less?

Supposing five hundred Americans are in slavery at Algiers: Our Consul demands the price of their redemption, per man; he is answered, the price of one is the price of the whole; and the price of the whole is the price of one; the sum is five hundred dollars. This, the Dey says, is not a consideration for the slaves, but to show America, or the United States, his power, and the dignity of his government. Our Consul obtains the money and pays it. Now, reader, do you think he would confine the benefits of this ransom-money, to a small part of those unfortunate Americans; and out of *five hundred*, send but *fifty* home to their *wives, children, country* and *friends;* and tell the remaining four hundred and fifty, that the money was his own, and he had a right to extend, or not extend the benefits of it, as he pleased; and that it was his pleasure that they should all wear out a miserable life in slavery, where they might dream of liberty, but never enjoy it? The smallest degree of humanity would argue better things.

We have now examined the foundation of this plan of atonement, and it has removed out of our sight; we have sought carefully after the penalty of the law, and cannot find it; we have sought for the satisfaction of such penal requirements, admitting they did exist, and find them not; we have admitted, for the sake of the query, that such satisfaction did take place, and we have sought for the consequences which are argued, and find them inconsistent with such premises.

Taking my leave of this plan of atonement, I shall introduce a third one, from which I shall also dissent, and give my reasons for so doing. The plan agrees with the former, in respect to the law, its *penalty and the* personage of him who makes

the atonement; but differs, in respect to the *intentions* of *God, in* the atonement. As far as the first transgression concerned mankind, it is believed that the atonement by Christ is fully efficacious; and that no man will, or can be miserable forever, on account of what is called *original sin*. And that, by virtue of the sufferings of Christ, Adam and *all* his posterity were immediately placed in a state of trial, or probation, after the *fall*, such as Adam was in, before, but with this difference, viz. man now knows good and evil, and is possessed of strong appetites to sin; but has also, a portion of the divine Spirit, which is given to every man, for his profit, to assist him in opposing those appetites, and subduing them.

Those who believe in this plan, believe that it was in the power of Adam, as a moral agent, to have stood in a state of holiness and innocency; and that it is now in the power of every man, as a moral agent, to obtain the paradise which Adam lost. They do not admit, that Christ died for our *actual* transgressions, after we come to years of discretion; but of *these* we must *repent*, and beg for *mercy*, and God will forgive, on our humble and sincere application. The sum of this plan of atonement, made salvation *possible* unto *all men*, but *certain* unto *none*. It argues, that it is the *will* of *God*, that *all* men should be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth; that *all* should repent of their sins, and receive the Redeemer on the reasonable terms upon which he is offered to us.

Those who believe in this plan, believe it possible for men to neglect those privileges, slight those merciful offers, and turn a deaf ear to all the warnings of the Spirit, until the day of their probation is ended, whereby all that the Saviour has

done, is made of no effect unto them. And that thousands will be thus neglectful, and be miserable as long as God exists; not however, for the sin which Adam committed, but for their own personal transgressions.

Before I put the foregoing system of atonement under examination, I will take notice of the character of the Mediator, as believed in, by all those who hold to the several systems of which I have taken notice, as I have not examined that particular, in my inquiries on the other systems preceding the one under consideration. They all contend, that the Mediator is *really God;* that the Godhead consists of *three distinct persons*, viz. *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost;* that these *distinct* persons are equal in power and glory, and *eternally* and *essentially one.*

The reader will observe my usual mode of reasoning, which is to admit, as truth, what I wish to oppose; and to oppose it, with the consequence which necessarily follows. For the sake of argument, then, I admit the foregoing statement of the character of Christ to be just; and then I contend, that if he be the *Son* of *God*, he is the *son* of *himself*, and is his own father; that he is no more the *Son* of *God*, than *God* is his *son!* To say, of two persons, exactly of the same age, that one of them is a real son of the other, is to confound good sense. If Jesus Christ were really *God*, it must be argued, that *God really died!* Again, if the Godhead consists of *three distinct* persons, and each of those *persons* be *infinite*, the *whole Godhead* amounts to the amazing sum of infinity, multiplied by three! If it is said, that neither of these three persons alone is infinite, I say, the *three together*, with the addition of a *million* more *such*, would

not make an *infinite being*. But supposing we get over all those absurdities, with as much ease as a miscalculation avoids the truth; and suppose that these three distinct persons formed the grand council in heaven, on the salvation of man, after the first transgression.

In this council, and on so momentous an occasion, the first person addresses the other two, saying, the colony which we have just planted on our new made earth, has rebelled, and you know the penalty, which is endless misery, must be immediately executed on the two delinquents, unless a dispensation can be devised more favorable to the offenders, and equally satisfactory to justice. As the attribute of justice spake in the first person, that of mercy speaks, in the second, and proposes a pardon. Justice opposes, and contends that his honor depends on the penalty's being put in execution. Mercy again replies, the second person in the Godhead shall suffer the penalty due to sin, and justice shall grant man a second probation, in which he may secure the life, which he, by rebellion, lost. That reasonable conditions should be proposed, and the third person should make them known to man, and give him proper directions how to fulfil them; and if man faithfully attend to these conditions, he secures his happiness; if not, mercy makes no more requests in favor of the offender. To this all agree; and it is registered accordingly.

It seems according to this plan, that man utterly failed, on the *first* trial, but now has the second opportunity. I would ask, is there any more certainty of his succeeding now, than there was before? Is it certain, according to this plan, that any of Adam's posterity will obtain salvation? Is *it not in the* power of all men to neglect those

conditions? If it be not, it destroys the nature of conditions, and of probation; if it be, then it is entirely uncertain, whether an individual soul will ever be saved by the gospel plan.

I have before shown it erroneous to suppose, that any finite being could suffer an infinite punishment, in any period of time; and I think it is also granted, that an *infinite* being cannot *suffer*. But, admitting the system of atonement to stand on the ground contended for, it was a matter of utter uncertainty, whether it would, in *any instance*, prove *efficacious*, as it respected the *salvation* of man.

A rich parent gives a large portion to his son, accompanied with good advice; the son turns prodigal, spends *all*, and gets into prison for debt. The father still loves the son, pays his debts, lets him out of prison, sets him at *liberty*, and gives him a thousand pounds more, which is all he ever can give him, and tells him to be more prudent. The prodigal, no sooner than he finds himself thus liberated, and in possession of a handsome property, goes into the same error, which brought him to ruin before, and finally meets the same consequences. The father has no more to give, and the son becomes a vagabond. I ask, did the parent act the part of wisdom, any more than the son did? If he had acted wisely, would he not have said to him, Son, I gave you much at the first; I gave you good advice; I told you, that industry and prudence alone would secure you from want; I told you, though your property were large, unless you put your money to interest, or into trade, it must dwindle; that if you threw away your time, in vain and foolish prodigality, the end would be what you have already experienced? and although I hoped better things of you, than

a total neglect of my admonitions, yet, I feared; and, for your good, have reserved one thousand pounds of what I intended to give you, which, had you been economical, I should, by this time, have committed to your care. But, as you have conducted so foolishly, I must, for your benefit, keep the remainder of your portion, until you prove yourself a convert, from prodigality to economy.

If the Almighty were ignorant, at first, when he put man in possession of privileges which he afterwards abused, it astonishes me that he should risk the last favor which he had to bestow, on principles which he had just seen fail. It will undoubtedly be acknowledged, by all, that Jehovah knew, as perfectly before transgression as afterward, what man would do, and how he would dispose of the advantages which he had bestowed on him. Then I ask, if God knew how man would abuse those privileges, and knew he would be eternally miserable, in consequence, was it an act of kindness, in God, to grant man such privileges? I ask, again, was it possible for that to fail, which the Almighty perfectly knew would take place? The answer will be, no. Then, when we have consolidated the whole down to its *real self*, all the privilege which God gave to those whom he knew would render themselves objects of his displeasure, was a *privilege* of incurring to themselves endless misery; I say more, he insured it to them himself, by putting that into their hands, by which he knew it would be effected.

I give my child a *loaded pistol*, which I tell him to discharge at a serpent, on his way where I have ordered him. I know perfectly well, when I give *him the pistol*, that he will carelessly *blow his own*

brains out with its contents, and *the serpent will go unhurt;* the child's end happens, accordingly. I leave the reader to judge, whether I am the murderer of my child; my *conscience* would inform me.

The Mediator suffered the penalty of the law, to reinstate man in a state of *probation; God made* a revelation to mankind, for their instruction; he inspired the ancient prophets, to speak of the things of his kingdom; sent his holy Spirit into the world, to lead and guide man into all truth; and all this is done, from the pure benevolence of God towards a sinful world, for its everlasting welfare, but *all* upon *uncertainties!* After all, man has it in his *power* to frustrate the whole plan of grace, and render it abortive! O! ye angels of celestial purity, had ye known this, ye would not have sung, on the auspicious birth-day of Emanuel, "*Great joy, which shall be unto all people.*"

On the other hand, it was possible for every son and daughter of Adam to accept of Christ, on the very easy terms of gospel obedience, and thereby to have secured the heavenly kingdom. This being granted, who knows they will not do it? Things that are *possible, may be done;* and who can say, for certainty, that those things which are possible, will not be effected? If it be an absolute certainty, that any will finally fail of gaining the prize, it is also an *absolute certainty*, that they have *no possible opportunity for it:* If there be an opportunity, and the prize be attainable by *all*, there is at least some room for hope; and were it the *real christian-hope*, it would be like an *anchor* to the *soul*, both *sure* and *steadfast*; but being founded *in the creature*, and not *in God*, it is *wavering* and *doubtful*.

On this system, it must be absurd to argue the *certainty* of the *endless misery* of any of the family

of man, as the *salvation of the whole is possible.* God, out of love to his creatures, made it *possible* for them *all* to obtain salvation; indeed, it is his will, that all should be saved from their sins; it is, also, the will of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit; it is the will of all holy beings in heaven, and of the saints on earth; prayers are daily offered up, from the altar of sacrifice, for its accomplishment: And if it be not done, the whole *Godhead* will be disappointed; mourning, instead of rejoicing, will be the employment of holy angels, and the saints will be stung with the keenest sensations of grief.

No one will dare to say he believes *God* can be *disappointed*, in any of his purposes; therefore, those who believe in the system last examined, must be dissatisfied with it, if their eyes should ever be opened to see its consequences.

Having examined those several systems of atonement, in as concise a method as was convenient, and having given my principal reasons for not adopting either, I now beg the attention of the reader to my second inquiry, viz.

The necessity of Atonement, and where satisfaction must be made.

I have, already, entered my protest, against the necessity of atonement, on the principles upon which christians have generally believed it, by showing the finite nature of sin, and the error of supposing that the law of God required the endless misery of mankind, as a penal requisition.

Atonement signifies *reconciliation*, or *satisfaction*, which is the same. It is a being *unreconciled to truth and justice*, which needs *reconciliation*; and it is a *dissatisfied being* which needs *satisfaction*. There-

, I raise my inquiry on the question, Is *God* the *econciled* or *dissatisfied party*, or is it *man ?* For our assistance on this question, let us turn attention to God's dealings with Adam on the of transgression, and the conduct of Adam, the sgressor. After Adam had eaten of the forbid- fruit, his eyes opened to the knowledge of d and evil, and he found himself naked, and eavored to hide himself from God, which he ainly would not have done, had he considered Maker his friend. Sin produced two errors in mind of Adam, which have been very incident nankind ever since; the first was, he believed *l* to be his enemy, in consequence of disobedi- e; and, secondly, that he could reconcile his ker, by works of his own. The first of these rs we discover, from Adam's endeavoring to s from *God ;* and the second is seen in his eavoring to clothe himself with the works of own hands. It is plain, that a material *change* l taken place in *Adam ;* but can we prove, that *alteration* happened in God? It is very evi- t, that Adam was unreconciled to God; but it qually as evident, that God was not unrecon- d to him. God's calling Adam, in the *cool* of day, and asking him where he was; clothing with a garment of skins, and promising that seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's d, are beautiful representations of the parental and fatherly care of the Creator. It ought e observed, that God pronounced no curse on m, but on the serpent. If the Almighty had *unreconciled* or *dissatisfied* with his creature , in room of promising him a final *victory* over *erpent*, the *curse* would undoubtedly have on the *object* of his *displeasure*.

To say, that God loved man any less, after transgression, than before, denies his *unchangeability*; but, to say, that man was wanting in love to God, places him in his real character. As God was not the unreconciled party, no atonement was necessary for his reconciliation. Where there is dissatisfaction, it presupposes an *injured* party; and can it be hard to determine which was *injured* by *sin*, the *Creator* or the *sinner?* If God were unreconciled to man, the atonement was necessary, to *renew* his *love* to his *creature;* but if *man* were the *unreconciled*, the *atonement* was necessary, to *renew* his *love* to his *creator*. The matter is now stated so plainly, that no person, who can read, can mistake.

I shall now endeavor to prove, from scripture, that the atonement by Chirst was the *effect*, and not the *cause* of God's love to man. See St. John iii. 16. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life." According to this passage, nothing is more plain in scripture, than the idea that what Christ did for sinners, was a consequence of God's love to them. Again, verse 17. "for God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." This passage says, that *God* did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world; but, according to the general idea of atonement, *Christ* stood as the *proxy* of *man*, and the world was tried in him, and condemned in him, and in him suffered the penalty of the law which man had transgressed. It is also said, in the text, that Christ was sent, that the world through him might be saved; which, *if true, goes to* prove, that the Father's object, in *Christ's coming* into the world, was the salvation

of the sinner, and not for the removing of any dissatisfaction in himself towards them. Again, see Rom. v. 8. "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were *yet sinners*, Christ died for us." As the *death* of *Christ* is here spoken of as a *commendation* of God's love to us, it ought to be considered as an *effect* and not the *cause* of that love. Again, 1 espistle of John, iv. 9. "In this was manifested the love of *God* towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him." If Christ's coming into the world were a manifestation of God's love to us, this love must have existed before he came, and his coming was an *effect* produced by it. Verse 10. "Herein is *love*, not that *we loved God*, but that *he loved us*, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Verse 19. "We love him because he *first* loved us."

From those passages, and many more which might be quoted, to the same effect, it is easy to learn, that, what the Mediator did for sinners, was the *consequence*, and not the *cause* of God's love to us. God being infinite in all his glorious attributes, he can by no means love, at one time, and hate the same object, at another. His divine omnisciency comprehended all the events of time and eternity; therefore, nothing could take place, to remove his love from an object on which it was placed. The Almighty had no occasion to dislike Adam, after transgression, any more than he had even before he made him; for, he knew as well then, that he would sin, as he did after it was actually done. The reason that we mortals love an object, at one time, and dislike it, at another, is the blindness of our understandings; we have not always the same view of the same object. We may

slight an object of great value, its excellences being out of our sight; and we may set our affections on one of no value, by erroneously attaching a value to it which it does not possess. But the Infinitely Wise is subject to no mistakes; he comprehends the whole futurition of all moral beings, and loves them as his own offspring, with a love consistent with his immutable existence. Therefore, it is evident, that God was not the unreconciled, and, of course, did not require an atonement to reconcile himself to his creatures.

Let us now turn on the other side, and see if man be not unreconciled to God; and if it would not be more reasonable, to reconcile man to his Maker, than to reconcile God to the sinner. See Psalm xiv. 2, 3. "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside; they are altogether become filthy: there is *none* that *doeth good, no not one.*"

The apostle Paul, in the third chapter of Romans, giving a general description of mankind, introduces it with the passage from Psalms, which I have just quoted, and continues it by an assemblage of various passages, see verse 13, &c. "Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues, they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes." It is very evident, that the apostle meant to exclude none from this description, as the reader may learn from verse 19. "Now we know, that what thing soever the law *saith, it saith* to them who are under the law; that

every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Again, chapter v. verse 12. "Wherefore, as by one man, sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." That the scriptures abundantly prove, that *all* men are sinners, and in an *unreconciled* state, considered under the law, or in the earthly nature, will not be disputed by any. Then it is certainly *man* that needs *reconciliation*. Men, while dictated by a carnal mind, are *dissatisfied* with *God;* they accuse him of being an hard master, reaping where he has not sown, and gathering where he has not strawed. They think of the Almighty, but desire not the knowledge of his ways. They behold no beauty in him; he appears as a *tyrant*, regardless of the happiness of his creatures. A consciousness of sin, without the knowledge of God, represents *Deity* as *angry*, and full of *vengeance;* in which sense, many scriptures are written, as I have before observed. How often do we find, that *God* has been provoked to wrath and jealousy, and his fury raised to a flame against the sinner? And how often do the scriptures represent him repenting of his anger, and growing calm! All these scriptures are written according to the circumstance of the creature, and the apprehensions which the unreconciled entertain of God. Viewing man in this state of unreconciliation to God, and holiness, it appears evidently necessary, that he should *receive* an *atonement* productive of a *renewal* of love to his maker. Without atonement, God could never be seen as he is, "altogether lovely, and the chiefest among ten thousand;" nor could he be loved with the whole heart, mind, might and strength. How often are men grum-

bling at Providence, that things should be governed as they are? How often are men displeased at the Supreme Being himself? What an *infinite* number of hard speeches have sinners spoken against God? All which argue the necessity of atonement, whereby those maladies may be healed.

What an infinite difference there is between the All-gracious and Merciful, and his lost and bewildered creatures? He, all glorious, without a spot in the whole infinitude of his nature; all lovely, without exception, and loving, without partiality. Who can tell the thousandth part of his love to his offspring? And this invariably the same through every dispensation, without the smallest abatement. But what can we say of man? Lost in the wilderness of sin, wandering in the by-paths of iniquity, lost to the knowledge of his heavenly Benefactor, and dissatisfied with his God; he goes on grumbling and complaining, attributing the worst of characters to the most merciful, and entertaining no regard for the fountain of all his comforts. God never called for a sacrifice to reconcile himself to man; but loved man so infinitely, that he was pleased to bruise his Son for our good, to give him to die, in *attestation* of love to sinners.

The belief, that the great Jehovah was offended with his creatures to that degree, that nothing but the death of Christ, or the endless misery of mankind, could appease his anger, is an idea that has done more injury to the christian religion, than the writings of all its opposers, for many centuries. The error has been fatal to the life and spirit of the religion of Christ in our world; all those principles which are to be *dreaded* by men, have been believed to exist in God; and professors

ve been moulded into the image of their Deity, l become more cruel than the uncultivated sav-e! A persecuting inquisition is a lively represen-ion of the God which professed christians have ieved in, ever since the apostacy. It is every y's practice to represent the Almighty so offend-with man, that he employs his infinite mind devising *unspeakable tortures*, as retaliations those with whom he is offended. Those ideas ve so obscured the whole nature of God from that the capacious religion of the human mind s been darkened by the almost impenetrable ud; even the tender charities of nature have en frozen with such tenets, and the natural endship common to human society, has, in a usand instances, been driven from the walks of n. But, says the reader, is it likely, that per-ution ever rose from men's believing, that God s an enemy to wicked men? Undoubtedly; , had all professors of christianity believed, that d had compassion on the ignorant, and those o are out of the way, how could they have per-uted those whom they believed in error? But, h contrary views, those who professed to be-ve in Christ, who professed to be the real disci-s of him who taught his disciples to *love* their *mies*, have been the fomenters of persecution; y have persecuted *even unto death*, those who id not *believe all the absurdities* in *orthodox ds*. It may be asked, if those animosities not arise from pride, ambition and carnal mind-ess? I answer, yes; and so does the *God* in *persecuting christians believe*, for they form d altogether like unto themselves; therefore, they vainly fancy they are in the service of God, they are following the dictates of

pride and unlawful ambition, the natural productions of a carnal mind? and atonement is the only remedy for the evil.

Men are dissatisfied with the Almighty and his providence; they are dissatisfied with, and are enemies of one another; whereas our true happiness consists in loving God, and our neighbors. Men in possession of vile appetites, pursue with greediness, their gratification; but still, they retain their wants, their souls are allied to heaven and holiness, and can never be happy without them. They are conscious of sin, and feel condemnation resting on their minds; they look forward to the awful scene of dissolution, and their souls start back with horror. *Death* is the *King of terrors* to the unreconciled; how awful are the thoughts of death to those whose hopes are only the feeble productions of their fears and wants, unsupported with divine evidence! O, how necessary is atoning grace, on such an occasion, whereby a divine confidence may be enjoyed; the value thereof cannot be estimated by earthly treasures; all the shining dust of India, and the riches of the south, are poverty when compared with the riches of a reconciled mind.

Without atonement, God's glorious design, in the everlasting welfare of his offspring, man, could never be effected; the ordination of an infinitely merciful God could never be carried into effect. The Almighty must not be deprived of the means of accomplishing his gracious designs. We read of his *covenant* with day and night, which cannot be broken; but it would be broken at once, should the causes cease that produce their changes. So of the *covenant* of eternal mercy, the testament *of eternal life*, it must be put in force by the death

of the testator, and its life and immortal glory be brought to light through his resurrection. Let it be understood, that it is man who receives the atonement, who stands in need of reconciliation, who, being dissatisfied, needs satisfaction; and not place those imperfections and wants in him who is infinite in his fulness; and the doctrine of atonement may be sought for in the nature of things, and found to be rational to the understanding.

That *man receives* the *atonement*, was evidently the opinion of St. Paul, see Romans v. 11. "And not only so, but we also *joy* in *God*, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom *we* have now *received* the *atonement*." Were there a single passage in the scriptures that would reach *half as far* in proving that *God* received the atonement, as the one just quoted does to prove that *man* received it, the matter might be considered more disputable than it now is.

We read, that men are enemies to God, by wicked works, which teaches us that *enmity* is wickedness: Should we then dare to say, that God is our enemy? It is wrong for us to be enemies even to those who injure us, much more to those who never had it in their power to do us any harm. I wish to ask, did any of God's creatures ever *injure him?* Surely not. Why then does he turn our enemy? He commands us to love our enemies, that we may be like him; but if *he hate his enemies, we must hate ours* if we would be like *him*. If he be *not our enemy, he* needs *no atonement*. But if men are *enemies* to *God, they need* an *atonement* to bring them to love him who loves them.

Here the reader will observe that we shun those difficulties *which* have represented the gospel as

Christ so inconsistent. We now view the Almighty the same, yesterday, to day and forever; by no means changed in his disposition towards his creatures, but always designing and working all things for their good. Here is no need of the self-contradictory notion of altering an unalterable being; of satisfying an infinite dissatisfaction; of reconciling a being who was never unreconciled; of producing love in love itself; of causing an eternal unchangeable friend to be friendly, or of offering a sacrifice to the eternal father of our spirits, to cause him to love and have mercy on his offspring.

How much more reasonable it is, to suppose *ourselves* in need of those alterations. But unhappily, men have looked at Deity through the medium of a carnal mind, and have formed *all their* evil tempers in *Jehovah;* like the deceived astronomer, who fancied he saw a monster in the sun, occasioned by a fly on his glass. The creature being in the medium of sight, was supposed to be in the object beheld; and though it was small in itself, and would have appeared so, could it have been seen where it was; yet carrying it into the sun, it magnified to an enormous size. So it is with our vile and sinful passions, could we behold them in ourselves, and view them as they are, they would appear in their finite and limited sphere; but the moment we form those passions in Deity, they magnify to infinity. Let a council of astronomers be called, who are all deceived by the fly; let them consult on the bigness of the monster, calculate how long it has been growing, and how soon it may wholly absorb the sun; let them endeavor to account for its cause, and analize its constitution, inform us of the degrees of

heat its lungs sustain, and how many degrees hotter it is than iron can be heated in a furnace. But here is room for disagreement, which may give rise to great disputations. To one, it appears much larger than to another; they cannot judge alike, with regard to its age, nor how much larger it will grow; some are ready to dispute its being a living creature, fancying it may be an opaque body. They are all agreed, that there is a phenomenon in the sun, but dispute, and even quarrel, about its peculiarities. What would become of all their calculations, the moment they should discover the fly? All would be gone, at once, and the sun would be relieved of the burden of so ponderous a monster.

How many various calculations have Divines made, on the *fury* and *wrath* which they have discovered in God! How much they have preached and written, on the awful subject; and how many ways they have invented, to appease such wrath and vengeance! When we come to see the error, and find those principles in ourselves, all those notions vanish at once. The fly on the glass might easily have been removed, or destroyed; but had there been a monster in the sun, what calculations could mortals have made to remove it; Enmity in man may be overcome with love; but, did it exist in God, it must be infinite and eternal.

To conclude, the supposition, that Deity receives the atonement, or any possible advantage from the gospel plan, whereby an alteration is effected in him, for the better, amounts to the inexplicable absurdity of making omniscience more wise, omnipotence more powerful, justice more just; and of giving love the power of loving, of making mercy *more* merciful, truth more true, and

goodness better; for these are the seven spirits of God, which are in all the earth, and they are without the shadow of turning.

Having shown, as I hope, to the reader's satisfaction, the necessity of atonement, and where satisfaction must be made and reconciliation take place, I shall pass to make some inquiries into

The personage of the Mediator who makes the Atonement, and his ability for performing the work.

I have already stated some of the absurdities contained in the opinions of most christians, respecting the Mediator; I shall now be a little more particular on the subject.

I shall contend, that the Mediator is a *created dependant* being. That he is a created being, is proved from Rev. iii. 14, where he is said to be "the beginning of the creation of God." His dependancy is proved, by his frequent prayers to the Father. That he acknowledged a superior, when on earth, is evident, from many passages which might be quoted. See St. John v. 19. Christ here says, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do." He acknowledged a superior in knowledge, see Mathew xxiv. 36. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." This passage implies, that he did not know of that day himself. St. Mark is still more explicit, see chap. xiii. 32. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the *Son*, but the Father." And further, that he acknowledges a superior, even in his risen glory, may be proved from his own words to his servant John, on the Isle of Patmos, *see Rev. iii. 12.* "Him that overcometh, will I

make a pillar in the temple of *my* God, and he shall go no more out; and I will write upon him the name of *my God*, and the name of the city of *my God*, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from *my God*, and I will write upon him my new name." Four times, in the above passage, he acknowledges a being whom he worships. Again, see Psalm xlv. 7. "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, *because* God, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." The reader will observe, I have ventured to put the word *because*, in room of the word *therefore*, in this quotation; but I have not done it without the authority of a former translation. The difference is so essential, I cannot dispense with it. Observe, the writer of the Psalm addresses one God, and speaks, in his address, of another, see verse 6, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." This God is dependant on another, expressed in the 7th verse, *Because* God, thy God hath anointed thee, &c. That the names, *God*, *Lord*, and *everlasting Father*, are applied to Christ, I shall not dispute; neither shall I dispute the propriety of it; But I do not admit, that they mean the self-existent Jehovah, when applied to the Mediator. In the quotation from the Psalm, Christ is said to be anointed *above his fellows*. Fellows are equals. Who are Christ's *equals?* Perhaps the reader may say, they are the Father and the Holy Spirit; but I can hardly believe, that Christ was anointed with the oil of gladness above his Father, neither do I believe any one will contend for it. I am sensible, that God speaks, by the prophet, of smiting the man who is his *fellow;* but this fellowship must be different from the one just spoken of, and stands only in an official sense.

The reader will then ask, if I would consider the Mediator no more than equal with men? I answer, yes, were it not that our Father and his Father, our God and his God, hath anointed him above his fellows. See Phillipians ii. 9. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name." For this exaltation and name, he was dependant on his Father, and received them from him. This name, which is above every name, is the name of God, named on Jesus. It will be said, Christ taught the people, that *he* and his *Father* were *one*. I grant he did, and if that prove him to be essentially God, the argument must run farther than the objector would wish to have it. See St. John xvii. 11. Christ prays that his disciples may be *one*, even as *he* and the *Father* are *one*. The oneness of the Father and Son, is their union and agreement in the great work which he has undertaken; and he prayed that his disciples might be as well agreed in the gospel of salvation, as he and his Father were, see verse 18. "As thou hast sent me into the world, so have I also sent them into the world." The Father of all mercies sent his Son Jesus into the world, for a certain purpose; and there was a perfect agreement between them, in all things. He says, he came not to do his *own will*, but the *will* of *him* who sent him. And again, My meat and drink, is to do the will of him who sent me, and to finish *his* work.

The President of the United States sends a minister to negociate a peace at a foreign court; this minister must conduct according to the authority which he derives from him, by whom he is sent; and as far as he does, he is, in his *official character*, *the power* that sent him. It is evident, Christ *re-*

ceived the *power* which he exercises in the work which he hath undertaken, and that his *kingdom* was *given* to him, which goes to prove, he did not eternally possess them; see Dan. vii. 14, "And there was *given* him dominion and glory, and a kingdom." According to the prophecy here quoted, the dominion, glory and kingdom of Christ were *given* him. The people whom he is to rule are *given* him, see Psalm ii. 8. "Ask of me, and I shall *give* thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." St. Matthew xxviii. 18. Jesus saith, "All *power* is *given* unto me in heaven and earth." Chap. xi. 27. "All things are *delivered* unto me of my Father." These and many more passages are found in sacred writ, in support of the dependance of the Mediator on the Supreme Eternal, and that he derives his power and glory from him. But if Christ be essentially God, all those scriptures seem without just signification.

Christ is said to be the "image of the invisible God, and the first born of every creature." His being the *first born* of every creature, agrees with his being the *beginning* of the *creation* of God. It is plain to me, from scripture, that the Mediator is the first human soul which was *created*, as Adam was the first man that was formed; and that he is, *in spirit*, the Father of every human creature, as much as Adam is *in* the *flesh*. Therefore, Christ saith, as it is written, "Behold I and the children that thou hast given me."

It is written, that man was created in the *image of God;* and, by the light of the gospel, St. Paul ventured to assert, that Christ was this image. The reader will do well to observe, that the *image* of a person, and the *person*, are not essentially

one, but some knowledge of a person may be obtained by his true image. Christ being the image of God, it is by him we learn the nature of the Father. Christ saith, "No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealeth him." Again, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." St. Paul is particular, on this subject, in his 1st Epistle to Timothy, see chap. ii. verse 5. "For there is *one God*, and one Mediator between god and men, the *man* Christ Jesus." It seems, by this testimony, that St. Paul was a stranger to the notion of Christ's being *essentially* God, as it would be improper to call him a man, were that the case. If it be argued, that Christ is God and man both, I ask, was it the *whole* divine nature which constituted the divinity of Christ? If this question be answered in the affirmative, I desire to know where that divinity is which constitutes the other two persons in the Godhead. If the question be answered in the negative, and it be argued, that the divinity which Christ possessed was an emanation from Jehovah, it is coming directly to what I contend for, viz. that he is a created being.

As we have seen, from the prophecy of Daniel, that Christ *received* his kingdom; so we are taught, by St. Paul, that he will deliver up his kingdom to the Father, when he has accomplished the grand object of his reign, see 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. "Then cometh the end, when he shall have *delivered* up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he *saith, all things* are put under him, it is manifest

that he is excepted which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be *subject* unto him that put all things under him, that *God* may be *all* in *all*."

Enough, perhaps, is written, on this part of my query, to make the matter plain to the reader, although much more might be quoted from the scriptures, in support of what I have argued.

I next inquire, has the Mediator power or ability, to perform the great work of atonement, which is the reconciliation of the world to God? Those scriptures, with their connexions, which I have quoted to prove the Mediator's dependancy, abundantly prove the sufficiency of his power to accomplish the work in which he is engaged. If all power in heaven and earth be committed to Christ, no doubt can be entertained of its sufficiency. If the whole system of law in moral nature be subservient to the designs of the Redeemer, and if he hold in his hands the power of moral government, it certainly must be at his option, whether men shall be reconciled to God, or not.

It may not be amiss to inquire, in this place, whether men, in their individual capacity, have the power of moral government? If they have, the great work of reconciliation might be performed by them, which would render the mission of Christ unnecessary. We ought not to suppose the Almighty ever purposed more than one way to produce the same event; if he have given ability to each individual to effect a complete reconciliation in himself, it is not consistent to believe that this work of reconciliation will be done by a Mediator; but if the work of reconciling *all things* to God be consigned to Christ, it is not reasonable to

believe we have power to perform it ourselves. And I think it will not be deemed admissable, that we have power to hinder this work of reconciliation, as that would, in effect, deny the truth of all power being given to Christ. We ought to consider, that Christ was by no means ignorant of man; that he needed none to testify of man, as he knew what was in man. He knew the moral distance which man had wandered from God, he knew all the expense of recovering him to holiness and happiness; and it appears rational, that he knew whether he possessed ability to defray this expense or not; and if he knew he did not possess this ability, he would not have undertaken it. We ought not to suppose the Mediator would act as unwisely as a man who undertakes to build a large house, without first counting the cost, to know if he be able to finish a building so expensive; or as a king would do, who should make war on another king, without first consulting whether he were able to contend with the double numbers which his adversary commanded.

St. Paul, writing to the Colossians, saith, of Christ, he is the first born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence; for it pleased the Father, that in him all fullness should dwell; and that the Father had made peace, through the blood of his cross; and then informs them for what this peace was made, see chap. i. verse 20. "By him to reconcile *all* things unto himself: by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." In Isaiah ix. 6, we have a beautiful prophetic testimony of the power and kingdom of the Saviour. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the *government* shall be upon his shoulder, and his

shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the y God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of ." And in the beginning of the next verse, :tent of his dominion is spoken of. "And increase of his government and peace there be no end." There is a great number of assages, which, in the course of this work, l have occasion to introduce; but enough is ly quoted, to show for what this power was to Christ, and that it is sufficient to ac- ish the end intended. Again, it may be rea- le to argue, that if the Almighty committed : into the hands of Christ, for the perform- of any thing whatever, if there should be , at last, a want of power for the work inten- t would prove a want of wisdom, in the giver h power. No one, who professes to believe in Christ, will dispute his power for the per- nce of all his will: But I wish to have the r satisfied, in respect to this power, and in it consists, which, to make as clear as possi- connect with my last particular in this gen- iquiry, which is

ATONEMENT IN ITS NATURE.

ave already observed that atonement and re- iation are the same. Reconciliation is a re- ı of love, and love is the law of the spirit of Christ Jesus, of which St. Paul speaks, in ıns viii. 2, by which he was made free from w of sin. The soul, when governed by the f sin which is in the members, of which St. speaks, in Romans vii. 23, is in a state of onciliation to the law of the Spirit. And it is ɔ force and power of the law of love, in Christ, he soul is delivered from the government of

the law of sin; the process of this deliverance is the work of atonement, or reconciliation.

The reader will now see, with ease, that, that power which causes us to hate sin, and love holiness, is the power of Christ, whereby atonement is made. All the law and the prophets rested on this spirit of love, by which alone they can be fulfilled. This eternal spirit of love is the *word*, or *logos*, which was, in the beginning, with God, and was God, which was hidden behind the letter of the law, and in the cabalistical allegories of the prophets, until it brake forth in the official character of Jesus and rent the veil of the temple from top to bottom. Our Saviour, in his official character, is always called by the name, or names, which is, or are, applicable to God, manifest in the *flesh*, which figuratively means the *letter* of the law; this circumstance will fully account for all the scriptures which my opponent would urge, in support of Jesus' being essentially God.

Christ came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil them; the law is as far fulfilled, in the soul, as it is brought to love God, in his adorable image, Jesus; and a complete fulfilment of the law and the prophets, will effect love, in every soul, on whom the law, in a moral sense, is binding.

Let it be asked, by what means are we brought to love God? Answer, "We love him because he first loved us." God's love to us is antecedent to our love to him, which refutes the notion of God's receiving the atonement; but the idea, that the manifestation of God's love to us, causes us to love him, and brings us to a renewal of love, (in which spirit we all stood, in our spiritual head, *Jesus*, before formation; and from which, we,

in a certain sense elapsed, after being made subject to vanity) is perfectly consonant to the necessity of atonement, it shows us what atonement is, and the power which the Mediator must have and exercise, in order to reconcile all things to God.

The method, by which we are brought to love any object, whatever, is, by seeing, or thinking we see, some beauty in the object; and our love is always in proportion to the apparent good qualities of the object seen.

While our minds are darkened, by the veil on the heart, in reading of Moses, so that the beauties of the ministration of life are hidden from our eyes, and its excellent glories are out of our sight, it is impossible that we should love Christ, or his word. Yet, during this darkness, we must love something; therefore, as sin and the vanities of elementary life present the greatest beauty to our eyes, of any objects which we behold, our affections are placed on those corruptible things.

Now I call up the question again, has Jesus power to cause us to love holiness, and to hate sin? Answer, yes, if he have power to reveal the divine beauties of the word, to remove the letter and its administration which are death, to take the veil from the heart, and to cause us to see himself altogether lovely.

When a sinner views God as an enemy, and grumbles concerning his being hard and austere, when he feels an aversion to him, and wishes to avoid his presence, it is certain the Son hath not revealed the Father to that soul. The ideas thus entertained of God are altogether wrong, and the mind that entertains them has no just conceptions of the Almighty. But blessed be the express im-

age of the Invisible; he hath power to reveal the true character of the Father, to remove the veil from the heart, and to let the sun-beams of divine light gently into the understanding; then God appears altogether lovely, and the chiefest among ten thousand, while the soul in ecstacy embraces the brightness of his glory, crying, "My Lord, and my God." But the idea of the *letter* is so fixed in the minds of christian people, in general, that the *veil* of the *law* is as fully on their minds, as it was on the Pharisees of old, which caused them to be blind to their Messiah when he came.

Christians have, for a long time, believed, that the *temporal death* of Christ made an atonement for sin, and that the *literal blood* of the man who was crucified, has efficacy to cleanse from guilt; but surely this is carnality, and carnal mindedness, if I have any knowledge of the apostle's meaning, where he says, "To be carnally minded, is death." The *letter killeth*, but the *spirit giveth life*. The apostles were made able ministers of the new testament, not of the *letter*, but of the *spirit*. Christ saith, "except ye *eat my flesh*, and *drink my blood*, ye have no *life* in you." Must we understand this in a *literal* sense? If we do, how shall we understand what he further says of this matter? "The *flesh* profiteth nothing; the words which I speak, they are *spirit* and they are life."

The apostacy of the Jews happened, in consequence of the lips of the priests not preserving knowledge; they fell from the *spirit* of the law, were lost in the wilderness of the letter, and therefore were blinded indeed. This was a figure of the more dreadful apostacy of christians, as were various other circumstances recorded in the old

testament. The christian apostacy happened, in the same way; and the church has been led into the wilderness of the letter, by an *hireling priesthood*, who knew nothing of the *spirit* of the law; who have preached, in the name of the Lord, the *letter*, which *killeth*, in room of the *spirit*, which giveth *life*.

The *literal* death of the man, Christ Jesus, is figurative; and all the life we obtain by it, is, by learning what is represented. The *literal body* of Jesus represented the whole letter of the law, with all the allegories contained in the word of prophecy. The death of the body of Jesus, represented the death and destruction of the letter, when the spirit comes forth, bursting the veil thereof, which is represented by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Agreeably to this, the reader will understand all the sacrifices, under the law, by which the High Priests entered within the veil.

Being thus enabled to pass from the *letter* to the spirit, we see what death it is, which is the proper sacrifice for sin, and what blood it is that cleanses from guilt. The *blood* is said to be the *life*, it is therefore the spirit or life of the law which does away sin, and gives life to the soul.

I am sensible there are thousands, who profess christianity, who are blind enough to object and say, "Then the gospel has nothing to do, in the salvation of mankind." But suffer me to say, the gospel is nothing but the spirit of the law, which is the word, or logos, spoken in the law, brought forth from the shadows of the first dispensation. To believe in any other atonement, than the putting off of the *old man*, with his deeds, and the putting on of the new man, which after God, is created in righteouness and true holiness, is carnal mindedness, and is death.

There is nothing in heaven above, nor in the earth beneath, that can do away sin, but love; and we have reason to be eternally thankful, that love is stronger than death, that many waters cannot quench it, nor the floods drown it; that it hath power to remove the moral maladies of mankind, and to make us free from the law of sin and death, to reconcile us to God, and, to wash us pure in the blood, or life, of the everlasting covenant. O love, thou great Physician of souls, what a work hast thou undertaken! All souls are thy patients; prosperous be thy labors, thou bruiser of the head of carnal mind.

In this view of the subject, we may see how the divine grace of reconciliation may be communicated to those who have never been privileged with the volume of divine revelation, and who have never heard the name of a Mediator proclaimed, as the only way of life and salvation. I have no doubt but thousands, whose education has taught them to look on the christian religion as an imposture, may possess a good degree of this love, which is the spirit of life in Christ Jesus; and though none can feel or experience this divine animation, only through the medium of the second Adam, I do not conceive that its agency is confined particularly to names, sects, denominations, people or kingdoms.

The *word*, which is nigh us, even in our hearts and mouths, is every where, operating, in some degree, in all hearts. The enmity, which God put between the seed of the serpent and the seed of the woman, is every where felt, and the two children are struggling in every breast. When the creature-like nature, or the carnal mind, which is enmity against God, leads the whole man captive,

it is then that the soul is in a state of unreconciliation and death; but when the heavenly child, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness, binds the strong man armed, and whispers heavenly invitations to the soul, revealing himself in the understanding, the soul immediately ceases to confer with flesh and blood, beholds with inexpressible admiration the heavenly beauties of the new nature, is moulded into its likeness, and experimentally becomes a child of God; the flaming sword is removed from the place of light; the way to the tree of life is opened, and the soul enters by the anchor of hope within the veil, where the cherubims are disarmed of the flaming sword, and stand looking down on the mercy seat, where God communes with his people. Thus, by the spirit of the word, the soul is brought to a sweet communion with God, it feels its eternal sonship, and rejoices therein, with joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Perhaps the christian reader will here pause, and say, my soul can witness, that, what the author writes, is true; but then, he does not tell of a regular *law work;* without which, the soul can never be brought to taste those delicacies in the gospel provisions. To this observation, I reply, I believe there are as egregious errors crept into the christian church, in this particular, as in any thing relative to the christian religion; and I further believe, that, among those, who have really tasted, that the Lord is gracious, there are such differences, on the above point, that, in many instances, they amount to a disfellowship, and tend greatly to destroy the blessed work begun in the soul. But those errors undoubtedly originate in some theories which are produced by the wisdom of the

carnal mind, which is so opposed to the wisdom from above, that it is always endeavoring to introduce something that may serve to raise animosities, and to sow discord among brethren.

Some, who, by the force of a false education, have been led to believe, that God is an enemy to the sinner, have supposed they were every day exposed to the just vengeance of the Almighty, and have fancied that they could clearly see the justice of God, in their eternal banishment from heaven and happiness; and they have been so wrecked, on this wheel of torture, as to be deprived of sleep and every kind of repose, for a tedious time, some longer and some shorter. Awful dreams, fraught with the most terrifying imaginations, have corroded the mind; and sometimes, a burning lake of fire and brimstone has been painted to the mind so clearly, that, for several days together, the poor frightened soul would feel as if it were on the brink of a precipice, expecting the next moment to be the fatal one. In this awful situation, it pleases God to manifest himself to the soul; and in a moment, all those frightful imaginations are dispersed, and an universal calm takes possession of the whole region of the mind. The soul now rejoices, as a captive set at liberty, or a pardoned criminal; and there is nothing to be heard, from him, but the praises of his Benefactor. In this hour of joy, should he hear ten thousand singing praises to his Redeemer, he would not wish to stop them, to know whether they had all felt just as he had, before he knew the truth. But, in a short time, carnal mind, still alive in the members, begins to make its intrusions, and in a very deceitful way. It pretends to wish to help the soul *along in religion*, and says, there must be a close

examination, it will not do to harbor errors, &c. But, in room of setting the creature to examine himself, it sets him to examine his brother; his brother happens to be one, who, in fact, loves Christ and his word, and, to all appearance, walks in the path of obedience; but, he is one, whose education was not quite so perverse as was his, and one who was taught, that God is an enemy to sin not to sinners; that he will chastise, for iniquity, but that God is not so incensed as some imagine. This brother cannot tell all that his interrogator has experienced, and is, therefore, rejected, for not telling a good *law work*.

It is now possible, that the reader is more surprised than before, and will say, the author does not talk like a christian; and, feeling some disagreeable emotion, he thinks he will read no further. But stop, dear sir; that determination may arise wholly from a want of divine charity. If you are, in reality, a christian, and stand in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, what you here read will do you no harm.

I am now about to examine your *law work*, as you call it, and shall argue, that, what you call law, is only a creature of false education.

Before you found peace, you thought you could see the justice of God, in your eternal exclusion from heaven and happiness. Now I ask, can you find, that God ever gave a law to man which required endless misery, in case of disobedience? Sure I am, the scriptures speak of none, neither do the dictates of good reason admit of its existence. Perhaps my opponent may say, we are not to use our *reason* in matters of religion. I answer, if we are not to understand the things of God, by scripture and reason, I am at a loss to know how to

come at them. I have before argued this point particularly, in order to show, that such a penalty does not exist in the law of God. Did you think, an exclusion from heaven and happiness would be an exclusion from holiness and righteouness? Did you ever see the justice of God, in your being sinful, unholy and impure? You answer, no. Then you never saw the justice of God, in your endless exclusion from heaven and happiness.

A false education has riveted the error in the minds of thousands, that God's law required endless misery to be inflicted on the sinner. How often do professed christians address the Almighty, and say, "Hadst thou been *just* to have marked iniquity, we should, long since, have been in the grave, with the dead, and in hell with the damned." This address amounts to nothing more, or less, than a complimental accusation against God, for injustice! It surprises me, to think how professed christians will contend for the honor and glory of God, in a way that renders his character infinitely inglorious and dishonorable.

Further, you believed, (you say) before you were a believer in the truth, that you stood in danger, every moment, of falling into endless misery. I would ask, if that were true, which you believed, before you believed the truth? I further ask, are you now exposed to those dreadful torments? You will say, you hope for the better. And what is it that now preserves you from such danger? You confess it is your Saviour. But was it not he who preserved you before your conversion? And are you more safe in his hands at one time than at another?

Some have gone so far, in their *law work*, as to *say, they saw* the justice of God so plainly, and it

appeared so beautiful, that they were perfectly willing to be endlessly miserable, according to its requirements. Such christians will not allow, that a person can be savingly converted, without being first willing to be endlessly miserable. This, I must confess, is a law work as unreconcilable to scripture and reason, as it is corrosive to the mind. The amount of it is this, I see so much beauty and divine excellency, in the justice of God, that I am perfectly willing to exist, to all eternity, in rebellion against it! I wish to know, what the soul has to be thankful for, in the work of salvation? If it be brought to be willing to be endlessly miserable, it cannot be thankful for the gift of eternal life. Again, if a willingness to be damned, is a good situation, the soul ought to continue in it; and then *hell* and *endless woe* would be as valuable a prize, for which to run, in the christian race, as *heaven* and *immortality*.

It is generally believed, the Saviour strives, by his Spirit, to bring the creature into a state of grace and salvation; and that the devil strives, with all his wily arts, to get the soul into hell and endless torments. Now, if these things be so, to which is the soul reconciled, when it is willing to be endlessly miserable? That multitudes have been in great fear of being rejected by the Almighty, at last, I have no doubt; for I confess those torments have been mine, in no small degree. But I contend, it is *impossible* for any one to be *willing* to be *endlessly miserable*. Happiness always was, and always will be, the grand object of all rational beings; and to reverse this object, would be to reverse man from a reasonable, to an unreasonable creature.

The above notion of law work, has been the awful mean of driving multitudes of blinded mortals into as much despair, as the mind is capable of. Honest hearted persons, who do not wish to be deceived, or to deceive others, knowing that they never felt willing to be damned, and being told they must be willing in order to be saved, have supposed, that God had already reprobated their fearful souls to endless ruin! Others have been so deceived, as to think they had better be willing to be *damned* than not to be *saved;* desiring salvation so much, they think they had better be *willing* to be shut out of heaven forever, than to miss of salvation, and have, either honestly or hypocritically, said, they were willing to be damned; expecting great favors, in consequence of the confession. The moment we have a just idea of the spirit of the law making an atonement for sin, all those absurdities and contradictions are removed, and their causes taken away.

I doubt not but God communicates his grace to persons laboring under every kind of deception; and in respect to that grace, no dispute arises, among believers. Their disputes arise, from notions which they entertained before they were enlightened, or from certain inventions of their own, afterwards, which do not arise from the spirit of truth.

The divine efficacy of this atoning grace may be communicated to the most vile and profligate person in the world, and stop him in his full career of wickedness; it can show the sinner, in a moment, the deformity of sin, and the beauty of holiness. In other instances, the morally virtuous are led a long time in concern and great trouble, about

themselves, before they find him of whom Moses and the prophets did write.

God is not confined to character, time or place, to work the work of atonement in the soul; he does all things well, and in the best time and way; and christians do very wrong, to contend about those differences which sin and deception caused in them, before they knew Christ.

Two persons are discoursing about the agreeable flavor of the pine-apple; one says to the other, it tastes very differently from what I expected it would before I tasted it; I thought it was a crabbed sour. Says the other, I am sure you never tasted of a pine-apple; for, before I tasted of one, I thought it was a disagreeable bitter. Thus they dispute, each in his turn arguing, that the other had never tasted of the fruit, because they had different ideas about it, before they actually had any knowledge of it.

Would you not, kind reader, advise those disputants to come to a solution of their question, in a different way? Surely you would; and if they could agree, about the real taste of the apple, you would advise them to let their former false notions alone.

Then, christian reader, go and do likewise, in the religion of Jesus; and wherever you find a brother, who has, in reality, *tasted* that the Lord is gracious, fellowship him, as one initiated into the kingdom of God.

Atonement by Christ, was never intended to perform impossibilities; therefore, it was never designed to make men agree, and live in peace, while they are destitute of love one to another; but it is calculated and designed to inspire the mind with that true love which will produce peace

in Jesus. As atonement is a complete fulfilment of the law of the heavenly man, it causes its recipient to love God and his fellow creatures, in as great a degree as he partakes of its nature. Ask one brought out of darkness into the marvellous light of the gospel, how God appears to him; and he will answer, more glorious than he can describe. Ask him how he feels towards his fellow men; and he will say, even of his enemies, he wishes them no worse than to enjoy the blessings of divine favor. In times of refreshing, how many thousands have been heard to speak of the goodness of the Lord, and of the infinite fulness of his grace; and with what love, affection and fervency, have they invited their fellow men to the rich provisions of the gospel!

The earth, in time of drought, ceases to be fruitful; the streams and springs thereof are dried up; the fields put off their robes of green, and gardens afford no fragrant delights; but when the heavens give the wonted blessing in gentle showers, how suddenly is the face of nature changed! The purling rill murmurs through the mead, pastures and fields teem with vegetation, and gardens blush with enamelled beauties. So the soul, unwatered with the rain of righteousness, and destitute of the waters of eternal life, is like a barren fig-tree that yields no wholesome fruit. But behold the transition; the moment atoning grace is effective in the mind, the parched ground becomes a pool, and the thirsty land, streams of water. The soul is like the earth that drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom they are dressed; and, like a garden well watered and cultivated, yielding all manner of precious fruits.

Look on the trees, after autumn has plucked their leaves, and winter frozen their trunks and limbs: Without faith in spring, their future life would be hopeless; but wait for the season of nature's appointment, when the increasing majesty of the sunbeams gently removes the chains of frost, and warm zephyrs are breathed on the surrounding snow, removing it from the land; the embryo blossom, nicely concealed in frost, now swells with genial heat; and the leaf, so nicely folded in winter's chest, now displays its matchless green, and the whole forest rejoices in expanded delights. So, if we look on man, in the sinful Adam, there is no appearance of heavenly life, or divine animation; the soul is bound in the fetters of sin, frozen with covetousness, and apparently dead in the winter of iniquity. But behold the Sun of righteousness arising with healing in his wings, removing sin, by the power of grace, and killing moral death, with divine life and animation, and causing the soul to rejoice in the kingdom of grace and glory. Then it may be rightly said, "The winter is past, the rains are over and gone, the flowers appear on the earth, and the time of singing is come." How mysterious are the ways of God! What infinite depths of wisdom lie concealed from the sight of mortals! He, who varies the seasons of the year, and diversifies nature through so great a number of changes, without losing the smallest particle of matter, can carry his rational creatures through all the dispensations designed in infinite wisdom, without losing any, and consummate the whole in glory at last.

Suffer me, kind reader, in my faithfulness with the saints, to excite a close examination. It can be of no avail, to believe, we are partakers of atone-

ing grace, unless that is really the case. I am of opinion, that many may be deceived in these things; some may suppose they are experimentally acquainted with them, when in reality, they have no other evidence of it, than that some godly minister, as they suppose him to be, can fellowship them as christians; while others do, in reality, feel this divine spirit of grace, in its atoning operations, but dare not suffer themselves to believe it, because they have not obtained the approbation of some, in whom they have been taught to put confidence.

I would, therefore, note some faithful evidences, in this case, which will not deceive us; and in doing this, I shall keep the reader close to the spirit of the law, which is love to God and man. From these two points and their consequences, all the evidence which can be obtained must be deduced. The question then is, do you love God? If you answer yes, I ask, why do you love him? and why do you endeavor to serve him? If you answer, because it is your duty, and you fear his rod, if you do not; I tell you, you are deceived; you have no real love to your Maker. Undoubtedly you would say, (as many vain professors have said) "If you were certain of salvation in the world to come, you would do all the mischief here you could." If the gospel of Jesus Christ have any enemies in this wicked world, you are of that class. Your profession of christianity, for forty or fifty years; your attention to church ordinances, and the mighty parade you have made in a round of (what you call) religious duties, have only served to paint you like a whited sepulchre: You lack the one thing needful, which is *love*. You are ready to *oppose all* professors of Christianity who do not

subscribe to your articles of faith. The weapons of your warfare are a tongue of slander, and a spirit of persecution; and you are daily raising false accusations against those who faithfully serve the Lord in spirit and in truth. The pharisees of old made as great professions of religion as you do, and were as punctual to those customs, whereby they made void the law, as you are to those, whereby you make void the gospel; and like you, they were zealous of defending their religion; and in their zeal they murdered the Lord of life and glory! Perhaps you will say, the author is hard in his reproofs. I reply, if you, who answer the questions as I have stated, are not of the class of which I speak, you will not feel the rebuke; but if you are, you not only deserve it, but greatly need it. On the other hand, if you can truly say, you love the Lord, on account of the divine beauties and excellencies you behold in him; that he is in truth, to you, altogether lovely, and the chiefest among ten thousand; that you delight in his service, because it is your meat and drink to do his will; that your greatest enjoyment is obedience to his commands, which are joyous and not grievous, and *in keeping* of which, there is *great reward;* let your denomination be what it may, let you live in what part of the world you will, you are a friend to the religion of Jesus, and you have sweet communion with him who sits at the right hand of God. Are you rich in the things of this world; you view all your possessions at the will, and you wish to have them at the disposal, of the Master whom you serve; are you adorned with titles of human honor, how sweet is it to lay all these things at the feet of him whom you esteem infinitely honorable. Are you poor in the goods of fortune,

you possess the true riches; are you a disconsolate widow, behold God is your husband, and the father of your fatherless children.

Atoning grace produces all which the bible means by conversion, or being born of the Spirit; it brings the mind from under the power and constitution of the earthly Adam, to live by faith on the Son of God, and to be ruled and governed, even in this life, in a great measure, by the law of the spirit of life, in Christ Jesus. It opens eternal things to our view and contemplation; it brings heaven into the soul, and clothes the man in his right mind; it inspires the soul with divine meekness and boldness, at the same time. It was this that enabled the apostles of our Lord to preach the gospel, in defiance of the rage of their enemies, and gave them immortal consolations in their sufferings for the cause of truth. It causes the christian to love all God's rational creatures, and to wish their saving knowledge of the truth; it produces good works in their purity, and all the morality worth the name is founded on it. Its divine power is stronger than any possible opposition, and the gates of hell cannot prevail against it; it opens a door of everlasting hope, and conducts the soul, by way of the cross, to immortality and eternal life. This dispensation of atonement is manifested through Christ, for the reconciliation of all things to God, in his glorious kingdom of holiness and happiness.

In this general view of atonement, I come to my last inquiry proposed in this treatise, viz.

The Consequences of Atonement to Mankind.

In this last inquiry, I must be a little more *lengthy, than in* either of the former, but I hope

not too tedious. What I shall contend for, as the consequences of atonement, is the *universal holiness* and *happiness* of mankind, in the final issue of the Redeemer's process. In doing this, I will,

First, Make a fair statement of the doctrine of universal salvation, as I understand it.

Secondly, Take notice of the most frequent objections stated against the doctrine, by various denominations. And

Lastly, Give my reasons for believing in my general proposition, from scripture and reason.

I will make the statement of the doctrine which I believe, as short as possible.

1st. God created man, in Christ the Mediator; in which creation, the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, of which St. Paul speaks to the Romans, was the whole governing principle of his nature.

2d. After the creation of man in this divine constitution, it pleased the Almighty to reduce him to a state of formation in flesh and blood; in which constitution, the *law* of *sin,* which St. Paul said he found in his members, became the governing principle of the whole man.

3d. God has revealed his divine and glorious purpose of bringing man back from his *formed* state, and from under the law of the earthly Adam, to his origiual *created* state, forever to be under the governing power of the law of the heavenly constitution.

The objections, of which notice will be taken, stand opposed to my third proposition: The first that I notice, is found in a proposition frequently stated, by modern divines, thus, "God, in the great and infinite plan of moral government, consults the greatest possible good to the whole sys-

tem; and in order for the greatest possible happiness to be produced, it was necessary, that some of God's rational creatures should be eternally miserable: Agreeable to which, all men cannot be saved." This is the only ground, on which an objection can be stated against universal holiness and happiness, while we admit the existence of an Infinite Supreme.

I cannot go into an examination of any authorities, on which the above statement is supposed to stand; for I know of none: All I can do, is to examine the statement itself. It is argued, agreeably to this proposition, that the infinite and inconceivable miseries of the wicked, in the world to come, will enhance the happiness of the glorified in heaven.

Against these statements I argue, if, in order for the greatest possible happiness to exist, the greatest possible misery must, also, exist, I wish to reverse the subject: Then the proposition would stand thus, in order for the greatest possible *evil* to exist, the greatest possible *good* must exist. Then, if God, in his universal plan, has produced as much *good* as was possible, he has also produced as much *evil* as possible, which renders the statement, that he consulted the greatest possible *evil*, as just, as that he consulted the greatest possible *good*. Of course, there is no more propriety in calling him *good*, than there is in calling him *bad!*

If it be said I carry this evil, or misery, too far, even beyond my opponent's meaning, I will endeavor to thow him, according to his own statement, that I do not. He says, *every degree* of misery in hell, will produce *many degrees* of happiness in heaven; if so, if the wretched be not made as miserable as possible, the blessed cannot be made

as happy as possible; if they are not made as happy as possible, they must experience some want; and, of course, some misery themselves. On the other hand, if the wretched be not as miserable as possible, they must have in possession some remaining convenience: Then, neither the greatest possible happiness, nor the greatest possible misery is produced.

Almighty God being put to the necessity of making some of his rational offspring eternally miserable, in order to make the rest forever happy, may be represented by a parent who has ten children; but only provisions enough to preserve the lives of five, until he could get more. In this awful dilemma, he sits down to consult the *greatest possible good;* says to himself, if I divide my provisions equally among my children, all must surely starve to death; but by neglecting five, I can save the lives of the other five, which he finally concludes to do. But I ask the rational, I petition the reasonable, I request the impartial, to guess the *feelings* of a *father*, on such an occasion! Before him, are ten children, *all* in the image of himself; he sees his own eyes roll in their heads, hears his own voice on their tongues, while his own blood frolics through their veins; how could he make the division? how could he decide on one, for a victim? Would he not rather give his own *flesh* to be their *meat*, and his own *blood* to be their *drink*, and fervently pray for plenty! But is the Almighty poor? Has he not enough and to spare? When the prodigal came home, did the father turn away his brother, so that he might have a plenty for him? Is there not fulness enough in God, to satisfy the wants of all his creatures? Why the necessity, then, of making some miserable eter-

nally? My opponent will say, the blessed are happified, in consequence of the misery of the wretched: But what reason can be given for such an idea? How do we look on a person, in this world, who manifests joy and happiness in the misery of one of his fellow creatures? Do we say, he manifests a godlike disposition? Surely no. From whence came charity; from heaven, or hell? If souls in heaven possess it, they cannot be happy, in consequence of the misery of any rational being; and should the divine principle be found in hell, it would banish misery, and annihilate the place!

Again, if a soul in heaven derive happiness, from seeing, say one half, or two thirds, of the human race in misery, would he not yet enjoy more, providing the whole, except himself, were in the same torment? If it be granted that he would, then, in order for a soul to be made as happy as possible, the whole human race, except that one, must be endlessly as miserable as possible! If it be argued, that it is not the number or multitudes of individuals who are made miserable, that thus constitutes or enhances the happiness of the blessed, but that it is the nature, justice and intenseness of this misery, which is necessary for the above purpose, it makes it very plain, that the eternal misery of *one* would produce as much good, as of ten thousand, or more.

We have now got so far, even on our opponent's ground, as to see, that there is no need of more than one soul's being endlessly miserable; and it still further appears to me, that the misery of *one* may be dispensed with, without departing from what my opponent has acknowledged; and that, *by letting* each individual of the human race, for

a moment, or any limited time, experience the nature of the misery contended for; and then giving them a memory to retain it fresh in mind forever; this must of necessity produce the effect as well, and without the expence of a single soul. I do not think it would absolutely require omniscient wisdom to concert a better plan than the one I am opposing.

Suppose we alter the circumstance of the father and his ten children: Suppose the father has provisions enough for the whole, and his object, in the bestowing of it upon them, is to cause the greatest possible happiness among his children. Which way would good sense and parental affection choose, either to feed five to the full, and starve the rest to death, that their *dying groans* might give the others a *better appetite*, and *their food* a *good relish*, or to let them all be hungry enough to relish their food well, and all alike partake of it?

I will take notice of a certain passage of scripture in this place, which some have endeavored to accommodate to the argument which I am disputing; see Rev. xiv. 10, 11. "The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." It is not because I am afraid of wounding this beast, or of affronting its rider, that I do not enter into a particular explanation of the passage recited; but because it deserves the labor of more time than I have now to

spare. However, the idea of my opponent is easily refuted; and this is as much as the reader ought to expect, in this work. The common idea is, that the punishment here spoken of is altogether in eternity, and not in this world of mortality; that it being in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb, it indicates that it affords pleasure in those heavenly mansions where they dwell.

First, I request the reader to observe, that the verbs, *ascendeth*, *have*, *worship*, and *receiveth*, are all in the same tense, which at least favors the idea, that the sulphurous smoke of this torment *ascendeth* up, at the same time that the tormented *worship* the beast. If the apocalyptical beast be worshipped to an endless eternity, it follows, that his worshippers will be tormented as long. Until it is proved, that some will worship this beast in another world, or endlessly, it cannot be proved from this passage, that any will be tormented, in another world, or endlessly. It is said, in the text, that, the worshippers of the beast have no rest *day* nor *night*. If it can be proved, that *day* and *night* are reckoned in another world, or in eternity, my opponent has better ground for his argument than I think he has.

This beast, undoubtedly, is Antichrist; the worshippers of the beast are apostatized christians of all denominations, since the christian apostacy: They have always been in wars and commotions, and have had no rest; and as for their being tormented, in all their public worship, with *fire* and *brimstone*, no argument is necessary to make it obvious.

Another objection, which has often been stated against the salvation of all men, stands in a pre-

tended axiom, viz. "A God *all mercy* is a God *unjust*." The force of this pretended axiom, as used against the salvation of all men, is, if God should do justly, by all men, he would be an unmerciful being; or, if he should shew mercy to all men, he would be an unjust being. There is nothing self-evident in this axiom, that I can see, but its own want of propriety; it represents *justice* and *mercy* at an eternal *variance*. According to this *axiom*, and the argument deducible from it, justice may be compared to a monstrous *wolf* in pursuit of a number of *lambs*, and *mercy* to a *shepherd* who is obliged to give up a large number of them, to gorge his omnivorous appetite, while he makes off with the rest.

I have, already, sufficiently refuted the idea of justice requiring the endless misery of the creature; and, until that notion can be supported by scripture, or reason, an objection against the salvation of all men, cannot be stated, from the nature of justice. I have, also, shewed, that, in order for justice to require the *endless misery* of any moral being, it must, of necessity, require the *endless continuance of sin*; than which, nothing is more absurd. Again, it is objected, as many are going out of this world daily, in a state of sinfulness and unreconciliation to God, and there being no alteration in the soul, for the better, after it leaves this natural life, millions must be miserable, as long as God exists. The force of this objection stands on the supposition, that there is no alteration for the better, after death. Could this supposition be proved, I grant it would substantiate a formidable, and (I think) an unanswerable objection against the final holiness and happiness of all men. I have often heard the objection made, but never heard

an evidence brought from scripture, or reason, to support the declaration. Divines being sensible of the want of scripture, to support this (their) supposition, have, very liberally, been at the expense of making some; and the notable passage which they have coined, and brought into very frequent use, is not to be found in the scriptures of the Old, or New Testament; but is frequently to be heard from the pulpit, read in many of their writings, and recited by many of their adherents. It is as follows: "*As the tree falls, so it lies; as death leaves us, so judgment will find us.*" I shall not contend about a different explanation of this addition to the scriptures, from the usual one; but will only say, if the thing, which my opponents would prove by it, be true, viz. that souls cannot be altered for the better, after death, all our christian people must remain eternally as unsanctified, as they are in this world of infirmities.

Again, many contend, that God deals with mankind as moral agents; that he sets life and death before us, and leaves us to make our own choice, and to fare accordingly: That, as our eternal state depends on what use we make of our agency, millions will prove rebellious, and, therefore, miss of salvation. But I query, if one soul can obtain salvation, on the principle of moral agency, why another cannot, as well? If it be granted he can, I ask, again, why all men cannot, as well as any? If it be still granted, I say, as I have before said, that which can be done may be done; therefore, the objection fails. But the objector will say, it renders universal salvation uncertain; I answer, no more than it renders universal damnation certain: All may be lost forever, as well as one; therefore, my opponent's

hopes are subject to the same shipwreck, to which he would expose mine. I would further inquire, if God deal with man upon a system of moral agency, is it God's revealed will, that all men should be saved, agreeably to their agency? If it be granted that it is, I further inquire, whether God's will, in the moral agency of man, will be eternally frustrated? If not, no objection stands against universalism; but the proposition, on which my opponent endeavors to substantiate an objection, favors the doctrine, as far as it goes.

In my observations on the *liberty* of *will*, I have given some of my ideas concerning agency, as it is generally understood; but moral agency may be very differently understood, by different persons. If, by moral agency, be meant an ability to love an object, or objects, which appear agreeable, I have no objections to make; but if it mean an ability to hate that which appears agreeable and to love that which appears disagreeable, I contend, no such agency exists, in any being within the compass of our knowledge. It is certainly reasonable to suppose, that all the agency possessed by man, was given him by his Maker; and that, when God gave him this agency, it was for a certain purpose, which purpose must, finally, be every way answered, providing God be infinitely wise. I cannot but think it incorrect, to suppose, that God ever gave any creature agency to perform what he never intended should be done.—Then, if any soul be made endlessly miserable, by its agency, it follows, that God gave that soul this agency for that unhappy purpose; and if any be saved, by their agency, God gave them their agency, for that blessed end. If any wish to make a different use of agency, let them state fairly, that

God gave man an agency, intending man's eternal salvation thereby; but man makes a different use of his agency, from what God intended, whereby the gracious designs of Deity are forever lost!

If my opponent will not fix his agency on some of the above noted principles as it respects the issue of the argument, I am sure he can do nothing with it to any effect. If agency be stated on the principle of God's intending the creature's salvation, by it, and it be granted, that his will, in the affair, will be done, it is an acknowledgment of the doctrine for which I contend. But if it be stated, that, although God gave man his agency, for the glorious purpose of his endless felicity, yet his purpose may fail; could this statement be proved true, it would not only refute universal salvation, but every thing else, as being a divine system, on which we may, with any confidence, depend.

One of the objections, on which the enemies of universal holiness and happiness put much dependance, and which they frequently urge against the doctrine is stated from the force of *unlimited words*, as they find a few of them in scripture applied to the misery of the wicked. The force of this objection, I remove, by proving, that unlimited words are applied to things and events which are not strictly eternal or endless; and surely, the candid reader will acknowledge this way of reasoning is just, and by no means evasive. I shall not labor this point largely, for it has been done faithfully by an able author, whose works are among us. I will only introduce a few scriptures, and make some observations on them, for the benefit of those of my readers who have not seen the *masterly* work referred to. See Gen. xvii. 7, 8.

"And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an *everlasting* covenant; to be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an *everlasting* possession; and I will be their God." Verse 13. "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh, for an *everlasting* covenant." In the above passage, the land of Canaan is called an *everlasting* possession. Will my opponent contend the word *everlasting* here means an endless duration? Will he contend, that Abraham now possesses the land wherein he was then a stranger, or that his seed do, or will, possess that land as long as God exists? If not, then the objection is given up.

Again, the covenant of *circumcision of the flesh* is called an *everlasting* covenant. Will the objector contend, that the covenant of circumcision in the *flesh* is now in force, and that it will remain in force as long as God exists? It is evident, from scripture, that these ordinances and this covenant are removed, and succeeded by a *covenant* which is called a *better* one; see Heb. viii. 6, 7, 8. "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a *better covenant*, which was established upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah." Chap. ix. 10, the apos-

tle argues, that the ordinances of the first covenant were imposed on the people until the time of reformation. Gen. xlviii. 3, 4. "And Jacob said unto Joseph, God Almighty appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me; and said unto me, behold, I will make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, and I will make thee a multitude of people; and will give this land to thy seed after thee, for an *everlasting* possession." And he further said, in the blessing of Joseph, "The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bounds of the *everlasting* hills. Exod. xl. 15. "And thou shalt anoint them (Aaron's sons) as thou anointed their father, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office; for their anointing shall *surely* be an *everlasting* priesthood throughout their generations." Lev. xvi. 34. "And this shall be an *everlasting* statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel, for all their sins once a year; and he did as the Lord commanded Moses." The reader may learn the abolishment of the priesthood, that is here called an *everlasting* priesthood, from Heb. vii. 11, 12. "If, therefore, perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Jonah ii. 6. "I went down to the bottom of the mountain; the earth with her bars was about me *forever:* yet hast thou brought up my life from corruption, O Lord my God." Many more passages might be quoted, to clear this point of argument, if more were neces-

sary; but depending some, as I ought to, on the candor of my reader, I forbear to be tedious.

In the next place, I will take notice of a number of scriptures in connexion, all of which have been erroneously applied to the future and endless misery of mankind. See Mal. iv. 1. "For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." Matt. iii. 10. "And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore, every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." Verse 12. "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thorougly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire." Chap. v. 29, 30. "And if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee, that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell." Chap. vii. 13, 14. "Enter in at the straight gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat: because straight is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Chap. xiii. 30. "Let both grow together until the time of harvest; and in the time of harvest, I will say unto the reapers, gather ye together, first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." The whole of the 25th, which is too lengthy to be written at large. The last paragraph of Luke xvi. Thess. i. 7, 8, 9. "And to you who are troubled, rest with us; when the

Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming *fire*, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." There are a number more scriptures of the like nature of the above quoted, to which I should be glad to attend, were it not for swelling this work too large. I will, however, after I have answered these in their order, take into consideration some others of a different kind. Those which I have quoted, mostly respect that dispensation which is represented by fire, which to illustrate more easily to the reader's understanding, I will first produce a passage from St. Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, iii. 15, which I will call my *key* text. "If any man's works shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." By my *key*, I learn, that the fire which causes the wicked to *suffer*, has the power of *salvation* even for the sufferers. So in all the passages recited, where *fire* is mentioned, it is evident the same fire is intended. "For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven." In this same chapter, this day is called the great and dreadful day of the *Lord*, who promised to send Elijah the prophet before that day come, whose business should be to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers, lest the Lord should smite the earth with a curse.

I inquire, first, concerning the coming of this prophet, in order to fix on a time for the commencement of this day of the Lord. That Elijah and *Elias* are the same, in scripture, no doubt will be

entertained. Then turn to Matt. xvii. 12, 13. "But I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed; likewise, shall also the Son of man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the baptist." By this scripture it appears, that the promise of the coming of Elijah the prophet, was fulfilled by the coming of John the baptist, who came in the spirit and power of Elias; which shows very clearly, that the gospel day, or coming of Messiah, was the day that should *burn* as an *oven*. The burning of an oven, is used here as a metaphor to represent the power of gospel light and love in the moral system. In the chapter preceding our text, Christ is prophecied of, as follows; see verse 1, and so on. Observe the fore runner is first spoken of, and then Christ himself. "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me;" thus far John the baptist is intended. "And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in, behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a *refiner's fire*, and like a fuller's soap. And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." The purpose intended by the fire of this day of the Lord is made very evident, by the above quotation, which, with my *key*, will much assist us in understanding the metaphor before us. First, how does an oven burn? Answer, so as to consume the combustibles which are in it, by which

the oven is prepared for the master's use, being perfectly cleansed, and of a right temperature to receive whatever the baker pleases to put into it. By this fire, the sons of Levi were to be cleansed, so as to offer an offering in righteousness; and by this fire, the hay, wood and stubble, are burned; but the possessor of them, though he *suffer loss*, yet is saved by it. Here we see, in room of the sinner's endless misery, his purification as a prerequisition for endless bliss and happiness. My opponent may urge, that the text says, the proud, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble, and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch; which hath respect to the *sinner*, and not to his *sins*. Be it so: But will the passage afford my opponent's inference, which is the endless duration of the sinner's misery? By no means; for that which is burnt up, *root* and *branch*, does no longer abide. To say, of a tree that it was burnt up, *root* and *branch*, would forbid the idea of its *enduring* the *fire always*. The total *annihilation* of the wicked, is a thousand times more literally proved, than his endless misery: and I may add, with propriety, that, the very words which my opponent urges in support of endless misery, are sufficient proof against it. I argue, that this particular part of the text alludes to the total destruction of the sinner, in respect to the nature of the earthly Adam; of which, neither *root* nor *branch* will be left. This I conceive to be in reality what the text means; and I am perfectly willing to rest the correctness of my ideas on the experience of any vital lover of the religion of Christ. Call to mind, what a *crackling* of *thorns*, what a *breaking up* of the *nether parts* of thy *soul*, what a *consumption*

eized every part, and what a *sinking* to *nothing*, when the *word* of *God*, the *spirit* of the *law*, which s *sharper* than any two edged sword, *pierced* to the *dividing* of thy *soul* and *spirit*, *joints* and *marrow*, and *plainly discerned* the *thoughts* and *intents* of thy *heart*, until thou found thyself on the rock of ages. By this method of understanding the scriptures, we understand them experimentally.

Further, observe what is said to those who fear the Lord, in the chapter where our text lies, "But unto you who fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise, with healing in his wings, and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall, and ye shall tread down the wicked, for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet." Who are they, who truly fear the name of the Lord? Those and those only, who have passed the *fire*, as above described; they receive healing from the Sun of righteousness, even from his *wings*, which are the *types* and *allegories* of the law, by which, the *word*, or *logos*, is brought to our understandings. Such grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But who are the wicked, which they are to tread down as ashes under their feet? Their neighbors? Yes, according to the conduct of apostatized christians who despise and persecute all who differ from their superstitions: But, according to truth, the wicked are their bodily, or creaturely natures and appetites. However hard it may seem to the reader, I say, the real christian lives above himself, and views his carnal appetites contemptible as ashes.

We pass to Matthew iii. 10. "And now also, the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore, every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire." In

order to see that the fire into which the trees are cast, when hewn down, is the same as that of which we have already spoken, observe verse 11. "I, indeed, baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not able to bear, he shall baptize you with the *Holy Ghost* and with *fire*." By this, we understand, that the fire, in our text, is that which accompanies the operation of the Holy Ghost, and is that fire with which Christ baptizes. Verse 12. "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner, but he will burn up the chaff with *unquenchable fire*." *Fire* is mentioned, in each of the three verses quoted, and its use is plainly shown, which is to *burn* the *trees* which bring not forth good fruit, to *accompany* the *Holy Ghost* in *baptism*, and to *consume* the *chaff* when the wheat is gathered into the garner.

Now let us look for the doctrine of endless misery, and see if it can be proved by the text under consideration. I will agree, that the *trees*, which do not bring forth *good fruit*, are wicked men; and my opposers must acknowledge, that they, and all the rest of mankind, are of that description, as it is written, "there is none that doeth good, no not one." And who will pretend the pharisees, to whom John spake, whom he calls a generation of vipers, were not wicked? And if casting the trees into the fire, mean casting sinners into remediless woe, I ask, if the baptism of the *Holy Ghost* and of *fire* mean the same thing? None will allow it; but all believe it to be salutary to all those who experience it. The reader will then observe, John told this generation of *vipers*, that he, who should *come after* him should *baptize them* with the *Holy*

Ghost, and with *fire*. How could those pharisees be made endlessly miserable, and yet be saved by the power of the Holy Ghost? If we examine the burning of the chaff, we shall find it to be by the same fire, and the consequences the same.

The reader may desire some more explanation of these passages; then learn, first, the *axe*, which is laid at the *root* of the *trees*, is the *executive power* of the *law;* the root, that Adamic nature, in which we all stand naturally; the trees, every individual of mankind; being hewn down, is being slain by the law; being cast into the *fire*, is being refined by the spirit of the law, whereby the soul is prepared for the kingdom of holiness and happiness. All this must be done for the best of characters in the earthly nature. In the similitude of the wheat and chaff, we have a very natural representation of man in two states; for as man, in his natural state, is encompassed with the imperfections of the earthly Adam, so he is represented by wheat, which, when growing in the field, is encompassed with chaff, which continues to confine it, until it comes to maturity, and a process is introduced which makes the separation. Here let me make some further use of the similitude than just to answer my point of argument. Wheat, though concealed from vulgar eyes, by chaff, yet, by the experienced, in the raising of grain, is perfectly well known; and we do not condemn wheat and throw it away, because nature has so ordered, that it is encompassed with chaff while growing in the field. So man is not to be valued the less by the wisdom of God, on account of the imperfections of his earthly nature. And we may, with great propriety, argue, that, as chaff is necessary for the growth of wheat, until it comes to ma-

turity; so are all the imperfections of man, viewed by divine wisdom, until the creature comes to that experience, which was intended in a state of imperfection. As the process which separates wheat from chaff, would disappoint the expectation of the husbandman, were it applied prematurely; so the *gospel*, by which men are prepared for the kingdom of God, must do its office in due time, or in the fulness of time. The state in which man is, prior to the knowledge of God and his heirship in him, is represented by wheat connected with chaff; and the state, unto which he is finally brought, by divine mercy, is represented by a *garner* which receives the wheat when it is separated from chaff. The unquenchable fire which consumes the chaff, is a significant figure of the power of gospel grace to remove all *excrescences* from our *hearts* and *consciences*, and to prepare us for the kingdom of immortal purity. What, but the *nature* of *God*, can be justly called *unquenchable fire?* If any other principle in the universe can justly bear that appellation, it must be *equal*, if not *superior*, to *God himself*. An apostle says, "our *God* is a *consuming fire*;" and I must consider it erroneous, to believe, that this *fire* is *quenchable*, or that there is more *unquenchable fires* than *one*. This *fire* of eternal *truth* will undoubtedly, destroy every thing which is in opposition to its nature; but has no power to destroy its own nature or its offspring. Now, if after these observations, the candid reader can see the eternal misery of mankind proved from the scriptures under consideration, all I have to add, is, that he can see more than I can.

We come next to that passage, made much use of, against universal holiness and happiness, found in Matthew v. 29, 30. The force of my oppo-

ient's argument rests on being "cast into *hell*," :onnected with the like passage in St. Mark ix. vhere the subject is exposed to be cast into the *ire* that *never* shall be *quenched*.

Let us first inquire what constitutes *hell*. The word, *hell*, undoubtedly, has different meanings in scripture, sometimes signifying the *grave*, and sometimes a state of great trouble of mind, in consequence of conscientious guilt. The hell, noted n our text, is of the latter signification, as no one will dispute; but my query is, what constitutes his hell. I conceive it to be produced by the conunction of contrary principles in the mind. All he vile appetites of man, were they gratified, without the least restraint, could never produce his *hell*, without the reflections of divine truth, in he understanding. Though the body might be lebilitated by it, and impregnated with corrosive lisorders, yet no disturbance is felt in the mind, ıntil a divine principle wakes up, like a light shining in a dark place. As when a traveller eners a dark cave for rest, though poisonous serpents abide there, yet he may be undisturbed, unil the sun rises and discovers to him, by what he had been entertained! He is shocked, his blood 'uns cold, and he is in distress, until he makes his escape. It is evident, that this traveller's trouble was produced by two circumstances; first, the serpents being there; and secondly, the light's giving him the knowledge of it. This glorious light of heaven is not to be accused, for having tormented the traveller; and yet, had it not been for that, he might have felt no disturbance. So it is with man; he might enter into all the vile abominations of a carnal mind; he might indulge his fleshly appetite in every sensual pleasure; he

might indulge his feet in every by-path, his eyes in every fleshly lust, and his hands in blood, and feel no remorse, were it not for this fire, which all the *floods* of *corruption* can never *quench*.

The next question, to which I wish to call the attention of the reader, is, whether the salvation of the sinner do not entirely depend on the force, power and unchangable nature of this divine fire, which opens his eyes to see the poisonous nature of carnal pleasures and earthly mindedness? Could all the black waters of the carnal or old man, in the least degree, quench the heat of this fire, I own the sinner is lost forever; but his salvation is hoped for, if the fire be never quenched. Here, again, the reader will observe, that, on the very expression, upon which my opponent builds his argument, I rest mine; shewing its propriety, by applying my key text, "If any man's work be burnt he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." The man, possessed of hay, wood and stubble, would not suffer the loss of them, were it not for that fire, by which the day of the Lord is revealed; neither could he be saved, with a gospel salvation, did not this fire consume those vile combustibles.

My opponent may urge his argument, on another expression, in connexion with this scripture, viz. "Where the worm dieth not." Should we be ever so critical, in investigating these words, they would be found to favor the idea for which I contend. If, by the *worm*, be meant the *wicked*, which I am willing to grant, and which I know my opposer will contend for, what I need to add, is, that, all it proves, is, this *fire* is not *death* to the *sinner*. All the *moral death*, to which men are exposed, is *carnal mindedness*; and all the moral

life, of which they can be possessed, is contained in that spirit of divine animation, which, in the scripture under consideration, is represented by *fire*, that never can be quenched. I am as fully persuaded, of this truth, as I am of any idea in all my study; and I believe my reader will be of my opinion, if he will observe what Christ has further said concerning it, in the conversation where the text lies; see Mark ix. 49, 50. "For every one shall be salted with *fire*, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt. Salt is good; but if the salt have lost its saltness, wherewith will you season it? Have *salt* in yourselves, and have peace one with another." All who observe attentively, will easily see, that the *fire*, with which every one is to be salted, is the same that never shall be quenched, and is that salt which Christ exhorts us to have in ourselves, which is productive of peace. The reader will easily see the impropriety of supposing such scriptures indicative of the endless misery of mankind; and the propriety of understanding them consonant with my key text, signifying the destruction of sin, and the salvation of the sinner.

We next take notice of Matthew vii. 13, 14. The argument against me, is rested on these expressions, viz. "And many there be which go in thereat," "And few there be that find it." In order to detect this argument, as laconically as possible, I first ask, do the words *few* and *many* mean the same number, when applied to the same subject of inquiry? I presume all will answer, no. I then ask, is it proper, or just, to say, the word, *many*, in Isaiah liii. 11. where it is written, "By his knowledge, shall my righteous servant justify *many*, for he shall bear their iniquities," means the same

number, as the word, *few*, in the text under consideration? Again, Rev. vii. After an account is given of the hundred and forty and four thousand, it is said, verse 9. "After this, I beheld, and lo, a *great multitude*, which no man could number, of *all nations*, and *kindreds*, and *people*, and *tongues*, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands." Will any one doubt the salvation of the *many*, spoken of by Isaiah, or the great multitude, quoted from Revelation? If they do not, they can, with no propriety, contend, that the *few*, spoken of by Christ, in the passage under examination, are all that will finally obtain salvation by him.

Let us now take notice of the text, in its true sense. The way of life is, now, what it always was, and always will be, which is Christ, the heavenly man; and the way to destruction is what it always was, and always will be, which is the earthly Adam, or carnal, or old man. Christ spake, in the then present tense, showing that the multitude were all travelling in earthly mindedness, which is death; and that those who had truly found him, of whom Moses and the prophets did write, who walked in the Spirit, and not in the flesh, were but *few*.

My opponent, seeing his objection, which rested on the words *few* and *many* answered, and the text rationally explained, aside from his idea, will wish to infer an argument, from what I have acknowledged, to oppose me. He will say, if the multitude, under the law, were not acquainted with the gospel, they must be forever lost from *holiness* and *happiness*, as they died in that state of ignorance. I have already attended to this objection, but wish to write a few words more on the subject.

supposition, that the soul cannot be altered for the better, after the death of the body, will confound the ideas of many who believe it. You ask one, who believes there is no alteration after death, whether he believe the saint to be as perfect while he lives in this world, as he will be hereafter? And he will say, no. Ask him if he expect to be perfectly fitted for heaven and eternal glory, while he inhabits this vile body, and he will answer, no; and yet, he holds there is no alteration after death. Why the idea has become so general, that souls cannot be enlightened, and converted from sin to holiness, after the death of the body, is difficult for me to determine. If the soul continue a rational being, cannot the All-wise communicate knowledge to it *out* of the natural body, as well as he can *in* it? If the soul, after death, have a moral existence, it must be a subject of moral principles, and stand accountable to a moral law adapted to his moral capacity; and it must be as much the duty of souls, hereafter, to yield obedience to God, as it is while they are in the body; and to preclude the possibility of such obedience, would be a dishonor to such a law. To deny the existence of those moral principles, in the world to come, is denying the existence of rational happiness, or punishment. My opponent will say, if God have revealed to us, in the scriptures of truth, that he will not afford any privilege after death, to those who do not become true converts to Christ, in this world, we have no right to say to the reverse, however much our reason may be put to confusion. I answer, that may be granted, without injury to my argument, as no such revelation has been made; when it is, it will be early enough to believe it.

The parable of the tares of the field, comes next under consideration. This passage needs not be quoted at large, as the reader has it perfectly in his mind. In order to do this subject justice, I will endeavor to state the objection on the ground, upon which I believe my opponent would choose to rest it; which is, the *tares* mean *wicked men* and *women* who are impenitent; and as the tares are to be burnt, it signifies the awful state into which God will cast the wicked, in the world to come. For the sake of argument, I will grant, for a moment, what the objector states, and further inquire, if the righteous, or believers in Christ, are represented by wheat, and the wicked by *tares*, what is meant by the *field*, in which these two kinds of seed are sown? It will not answer any one's mind, to say, that the field is the same as the seed sown; then, what is it? Says my opponent, it is the earth, on which the righteous and the wicked live; be it so; then let us seek the consequences. Of the tares, it is said, he that sowed them is the devil. According to this mode of reasoning, God has produced some of the inhabitants of the earth, and the devil some; and all the wrong there is, in the affair, is a matter of trespass. The devil has sown ground that did not belong to him, as it appears, by the text, that the field belonged to him who sowed the good seed; and that he who sowed the tares occupied ground that did not belong to him. I do not see why the devil could not have created an earth, as easily as to create men and women; and then, he might have occupied his own territory unmolested! I do not wish to take too much advantage of an error, but I wish to make this matter so plain, that no reader may fail of seeing the merits of the

query. I will, therefore, inquire, further, what constitutes those wicked, whom the devil placed on this earth? Have they ever deserted the service of Satan; and, rebelling against their maker, sinfully yielded obedience to God? If they have faithfully served their creator, I can see no sinfulness in them, and it would be bad argument, to say, that God would subject beings to his government whom he did not make. The thoughts of such consequences wean the objector's mind from the premises which afford them, and other answers to the question proposed must be sought for. What is meant by wheat? what, by tares? and what, by field, in which the wheat and tares were sown? I think the answers must be as follow: The *wheat* means the same as is meant by *seed* spoken of in a former parable, the explanation of which introduces the one under examination. In the parable of the sower, it is plain, that Christ meant the gospel, or the doctrine of truth, by *seed* which he sowed; and by the various kinds of soil into which the seed fell, is meant the various circumstances, in a moral sense, of those to whom he preached the word of the kingdom. The truth then is plain; by wheat, is meant the true doctrine of Christ; the tares mean false doctrines which would be introduced by Antichrist; and the field is mankind, or the church. Christ undoubtedly meant to represent the christian apostacy, in this parable; in which state of the church, we find truth and error mixed, the gospel of life, and the doctrine of endless damnation, like wheat and tares in the same field. Christians have framed to themselves doctrinal creeds and modes of faith, and called them orthodox; they have bowed down to their images, and said,

These are the gods which brought us up out of the land of Egypt; they have endeavored, by fire and sword, to destroy heresy, in which they have been as unskilful as Christ represented in the parable; they were as likely to root up the wheat as the tares. But when these doctrines have brought forth their fruits, and it shall appear evident to all, that evil consequences have always attended those creeds formed by men, it will be easy for those who are wise in the gospel, to gather those tares, and *burn* them with that fire which consumes the hay, wood and stubble; and to gather the true doctrine of gospel promises into the garner, or church of Christ, no more to be mixed with tares or falsehood.

What a pity it is, speaking in reference to partial good and evil, that professed ministers of Christ should so vehemently contend for the truth of doctrines which they themselves acknowledge no being wishes true, but the devil and his subordinate wicked spirits. It is the general topic of the day in this enlightened land, contended for in almost every pulpit, that some of God's rational dependant creatures must of *necessity*, suffer in endless torments, with devils, to blaspheme God forever, and never cease from sin, which, they, who believe and preach it, wish and daily pray, might be false. If false doctrines were intended, by tares, in this parable, and those tares are to be destroyed, the consequence must be salutary, to mankind, for they will then know the truth, and the truth will make them free.

My opponent may urge that his ideas of the parable of the tares are most consonant to the explanation which Christ gave it, as it is there said, the *tares are the children of the wicked one, &c.* I do *not wish* to explain Christ's explanation; but I be-

lieve the reader of the present day, would be as likely to misunderstand the explanation as the parable itself. I know Christ said, the *good seed* are the *children* of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one. But I do not conceive, that, by *children* of the *kingdom*, in this parable, is meant the same as is meant by the same expressions in some other passages; instance one, see Matthew viii. 12. "But the *children* of the *kingdom* shall be cast out into outer darkness," &c.; no one will suppose, that the *children* of the *kingdom*, in the above quotation, are the same with those in the parable. Whatever is born of God, is a child of God; and this may be said of a person who is born into the kingdom of truth and grace; or of that true *faith* by which he is so born, this faith being a divine production. For proof, see 1 John iii. 9. "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin." Here, no doubt a human being may be intended; again, see chap. v. 4. "For *whatsoever* is born of God overcometh the world, and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our *faith*." In this passage, true faith is said to be born of God, and therefore my idea that the truths of the gospel ought to be considered the children of the kingdom, according to the parable, may appear consistent. I am disposed, however, to condescend so much to my opponent, as to acknowledge, that the wicked are sometimes said to be the *children* of the devil, &c. see St. John viii. 44. "Ye are of your father the devil." See verse 37. "I know that ye be Abraham's seed." Again, verse 39. "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." I am sure, my opponent would not wish to prove more from the above quotations than that those Jews were virtu-

ally the children of Abraham, but *characteristically* the children of the devil. Then, admitting wicked men are represented by tares in the parable, and this representation is a representation of character, then the destruction of the tares signifies a *destruction* of *evil* character, which argument, though I do not want, is forced upon me to my advantage in the query.

The whole of the 25th chapter of Matthew, which contains the parable of the virgins, of the talents, and of the sheep and goats, is considered directly against the universal holiness and happiness of mankind. In the parable of the virgins, those were called foolish who took no oil in their vessels with their lamps, who were not ready to go into the marriage when the bridegroom came, but afterwards knocked, saying, *Lord, Lord,* open unto unto us, but were answered by Christ, "Verily I say unto you, I know you not."

Those foolish virgins, says my opposer, represent those who are to be rejected at last, who will be miserable as long as God exists. On supposition that were the case, how can it be proved? Is there any thing in this scripture, that positively testifies that to be the case? My opponent will not contend there is, but only a parabolical allusion to the eternal destruction of the wicked, not positive testimony of it. But I wish to say, it is my opinion, that a doctrine ought to be proved by plain testimony, before we can be authorized to apply allegories and parables to it. Supposing I were unable to give any rational account of the meaning of this parable, would it give my opponent any advantage? Would it not rest with him to prove that his application of the parable is just, *before* he ought to bring it as an objection against

the doctrine for which I argue? If the reader can find any thing in the parable which necessarily means endless misery, all I can say, is, he has made a discovery which I have not. But as I do not judge myself altogether ignorant of the true meaning of this parable, I will trouble the reader with a few inquiries explanatory of the passage. "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." When? Is that time yet future? If it be, nothing is to be understood by the connexion of the discourse. The word, *then*, has reference to a designated time, which we find in the 24th chap. and 34th verse. "Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things shall be fulfilled." According to the words of Christ, who undoubtedly knew his own meaning better than we do, all things prophesied of, in the 24th chap. were fulfilled in that generation. Look back to the 23d chap. and 36th verse. "Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation." The time of that generation was the time of the fulfilment of all things spoken of in the 24th and 25th chapters; there is no other time designated for the word, *then*, to apply to. I must inquire, what kingdom of heaven this is, which is represented by ten virgins, five of which are wise and five are foolish. One half of the kingdom of heaven, according to this parable, is composed of foolish virgins! This cannot mean the kingdom of eternal righteousness, where wisdom in her purity dwells.

The foregoing observations may prepare the mind for the following concise explanation. The Jews, or God's covenant people, under the legal dispensation, are here represented by ten virgins. The close of the law dispensation, and the intro-

duction of the gospel, is the time alluded to, in the parable. The lamps, signify the rites and ordinances of the Levitical priesthood, which contained the light of the expected Messiah. The oil, which the wise had in their vessels, with their lamps, was the knowledge of what those figures represented. The foolish not looking from these rites to the antitype, but expecting salvation by the letter, were called foolish. John was the friend of the bridegroom, and was the voice of one, crying, behold, the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him. Midnight, represents the state of gross darkness which then covered the people.

When Christ entered the *sanctum sanctorum*, by his resurrection, and those whom he had chosen were ready, the door of the law was forever closed. The situation of the Jews, ever since, is represented, by virgins without, knocking for entrance, &c.

The reader will undoubtedly acknowledge the propriety of the above short explanation, but will endeavor to make some efforts against me, with those blinded Jews. The idea, that the Jews were so rejected by Christ, that they would never obtain mercy by him, perhaps is not warrantable from the scriptures. The reverse appears evident, from the testimony of Christ to them, see Matthew xxiii. 37, 38, 39. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate; for I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall *say, blessed* is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The fore part of the above is frequently recited, to prove the endless rejection of the Jews, but the

latter clause fully refutes such a sentiment. For, though Christ spake of the desolate state in which the Jews would be, for a season; yet, he points to a time when they should see him, and call him blessed. If my opponent can reconcile this glorious prophecy with the endless exclusion of those Jews, I will not contend against him any more.

We shall find it no less difficult, to support the doctrine of endless misery, by the parable of the talents, than by the parable of the virgins. The words which close this parable are what my opponent would found his objection upon, see verse 30. "And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." That, says my opposer, means *endless* misery; but how am I to know it does? Or how does he know it? Does the text necessarily carry that meaning? No, it does not. The Psalmist says, "Weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning." But if the night of weeping be endless, when will the morning of joy come? The prophet Isaiah says, that God shall wipe tears from *all* faces; but if Christ meant, in this parable, that some of the human race should weep to an endless eternity, he was of a different opinion from the prophet. Can we be justified in explaining the scriptures into a positive contradiction? Must tradition cause the whole bible to bow down, on hearing all kinds of music, to the images which, by the craft of men, have been set up? Must the vain suppositions of men supercede the divine oracle? Must the divine light of the plain testimony of the spirit of prophecy become *dim* before the moon shine of tradition? Without explaining this parable particularly, which

I have done in my Notes, I dismiss it, observing, it represents the same to which I applied the former.

The parable of the sheep and goats, which concludes the 25th of Matthew, has been made great use of, to oppose universal holiness and happiness, and to support the doctrine of *endless* misery. Those arguments have been rested on the last words of the chapter, which read thus, "And these shall go away into *everlasting punishment*, but the righteous into *life eternal*." The word *everlasting*, being applied to the misery of the wicked, it is contended that it must be endless. But I have sufficiently proved, that the word *everlasting*, is frequently applied to events which are not strictly *eternal;* therefore, to contend for endless misery, from the force of that word, is begging ground which ought to have been given up before now.

The adversaries of the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness have contended, with great seeming assurance, that if the word *everlasting*, which is here applied to the punishment of the wicked, do not mean an endless duration, the word *eternal*, used in the text, may not, as they both come from the same root; and consequently, they have urged that the happiness of the righteous may come to an end, if the misery of the wicked do. In answer to so much ingenuity and argument, I say, the word *eternal* is not applied to the *duration* of happiness, but to the nature of that life which is brought to light through the gospel; and as that life is of the nature of the unchangeable Deity, we justly believe it to be endless; but I grant the *word eternal*, being applied to it, does not prove it to be so. Neither do I suppose it *certain*, that those, who entered into this life, at

that time, continued invariably in the spirit of it. I believe a person may, by the grace of God, enter into the enjoyments of this eternal life, at one time, and at another, by reason of his folly, may lose those enjoyments. Now, having shown the weakness of what the pretended critic has argued, I will give a few leading features of the parable; not taking up time to be particular, for reasons already given.

The time of Christ's coming in his glory, was the day of pentecost. His holy angels, with whom he came, were his chosen apostles. His glory, is the gospel of eternal life. Sheep and goats, signify believers and unbelievers. *Right* hand and *left*, mean *gospel* and *law*. The believer stands in the gospel of life: The unbeliever is condemned already, and the wrath of God, in the letter of the law, abideth upon him. For proof, that Christ's coming was in that generation, see Matthew xvi. 27, 28. "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom." If Christ is to be understood as he said, if his words explain his meaning, it is clear, that his coming in his glory, with his angels, to reward men, according to their works, was some time in the lifetime of those to whom he spake. If this be true, which my opponent with his eyes open, will not dispute, then no objection can be stated, from this parable, against the final holiness and happiness of all men. Should any say, (as many have said) that they see no parable in the last paragraph of the 25th of St. Matthew, I will only

add, if there be no parable in it, it only respects two kinds of animals, called sheep and goats, and we have nothing to do with it. We come to the last paragraph in the 16th of St. Luke, of which, much use has been made against the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness; and is said to contain a very literal account of the death of a rich man, and of his being in hell, after death; and the death of a poor man, and his future happiness. It is contended, by the most of those who oppose the doctrine which I endeavor to vindicate, that this paragraph ought to be taken and understood in its most literal sense, and that Christ did not intend it as a parable. Though I am very far from believing this paragraph to be a literal account, yet, I will admit it, for the better accommodating of the argument. For if I do not, but only give my opinion on the passage, my opponent will contend, that the objection is not answered, as he rests it on the literality of the passage. Admitting the account just as literal as my opposer views it, is it possible for him to substantiate an objection against me, from it? I think not; for, were it possible to prove, than an individual, who died in the days of Noah, had continued, from that time until now, in a state of misery, it would have no force to prove, that such individual would be miserable a single year longer, much less, to prove he would be endlessly so. Further, could it be proved, that a person, who recently died, would be in the worst of torments, for a *million* of years to come, it would fall infinitely short of proving that he would suffer *endlessly*. If the suffering of a rational being, for a time, prove, that this being must be *endlessly* miserable, the proof stands against the whole family of Adam, not excepting Jesus

himself. If my opponent be under the necessity of giving me the argument, in this particular, which I know he must, then, what evidence has he left, in the scripture under consideration, to prove *endless* misery? If it be urged against me, that the *gulph*, between Abraham and the rich man, was *impassable*, it proves nothing, with regard to its duration. Let us now examine the passage a little, taking notice of the common ideas of it. It is said, that the rich man lifted up his eyes in *hell*. Now it is believed and argued, that souls, in hell, are as destitute of any principle of goodness, as the devil in which people believe; that they are fully engaged in the devil's service, and opposed to any thing and all things which are favorable to the kingdom of the Saviour. This being the case, how is it that we have such an account of the prayer which the rich man made to his father Abraham, in favor of his five brethren? He seems to be anxious for their welfare, and desires that they might not come into such a place of torment as he was in. How would such a prayer please Belzebub, the prince of devils? Did I believe in such a being, according to the general idea which people have of him, I should suppose he would be very much alarmed, on hearing such benevolent prayers made in his dark dominions! The prayer seems to favor the plan of gospel grace, more than the vile purposes of Satan, though it did not seem to dictate the matter exactly according to the divine purpose. It is generally believed that the devil is desirous of getting as many as posssible into misery; if so, and the rich man desired that his bretheren might not come into that place of torment, let his reasons be what they might, it is evident that his desires were opposed to the dev-

il's. "A kingdom, divided against itself, cannot stand." Again, it is argued, by some, that those who are in heaven will rejoice, in consequence of the misery of those whom they see in torment, as the justice of God will, by their torments, be made to appear more glorious than it otherwise could, which, by the way, answers the most fervent desires of Satan. This being granted, should those, who are in heaven, on seeing those in hell, who, in this world, were their nearest connexions, feel the smallest regret, much more, desire to grant them assistance, it would be a complete violation of that justice which confined them there. But in our text, it is shown, that those, who are in Abraham's bosom, are desirous of going to the rich man, and their object is plainly seen, that it is to relieve him from his torments, see verse 26, "So that *those* who *would pass* from *hence* to *you* cannot." It is very evident, that those, who were in Abraham's bosom, were desirous of assisting the rich man; and, according to the common idea, it must have been deemed a rebellion against the will and justice of God, in consequence of which, if the devil deserved to be cast out of heaven, for his disobedience, these undoubtedly deserved the same condemnation! If we look impartially into these things, it is easy to see, that something wrong has been entertained in the common idea. By a little attention to the introduction of this paragraph, the reader may easily see the whole was intended as a similitude, to show the *adultery* which the high priest would commit, in rejecting the gospel, and endeavoring to obtain justification, by attending to the law in the letter, the situation of that part of Israel that was broken off through unbelief, which is represented by

five foolish virgins in the 25th of Matthew; the conversion of the Gentiles to christianity, and their reception into Abraham's *faith*, &c.

We pass to take notice of 2d Thess. i. 7, 8, 9. My opponent depends on the words, "everlasting destruction," on which to found his argument against the salvation of all men; but as I have before proved, that the word, *everlasting*, does not necessarily mean an endless duration, my opponent would fail in his argument, even if he could show, that the word, *everlasting*, in the text, was applied to the duration of suffering; but this he cannot do; for the word, *everlasting*, is not applied to the *duration* of *punishment*, but to the *destruction* with which the sinner is punished. That which is destroyed, I grant, is endlessly destroyed. But here I call in my key text, to show, that it is the hay, wood and stubble which are to be destroyed. This will appear evident, if we observe the nature of the fire mentioned in our text. "And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be *revealed* from *heaven*, with his mighty angels *in flaming fire*, taking vengeance," &c. This fire is that *in* which *Christ* is revealed, and it comes from heaven. Is not this the *fire* with which he baptizes? Is not the fire revealed, to destroy the hay, the wood, and the stubble? Undoubtedly: and is the endless misery of the sinner to be proved, from the action of that divine fire which alone is able to effect his salvation? But the objector says, the text reads for itself, "Who shall be *punished* with *everlasting* destruction *from* the presence of the Lord, and *from* the glory of his *power*;" and if the sinner be punished *from* the presence of the Lord, he cannot be blessed *in* it, where there are joys forevermore. Answer,

there is not a place in the universe which is *out* of the presence of an *omnipresent* God; therefore, to put a sinner from the presence of the Lord, he must be put out of the universe. But what means the text? says the reader; answer, that divine light and heat, which destroys moral darkness, and purges man from all sin is *from* the presence of the Lord as a production of the divine presence, as it is written concerning the man of sin, whom the Lord shall consume with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming. If God were not able to punish the sinner, in the manner described in the text, I should despair of his salvation; but blessed be that divine spirit of light and love; it truly takes such vengeance on the sinner as is worthy of a God. It makes him hate sin, brings down the high mountains of his pride, takes away the fig-leaf garment, and clothes the man in his right mind.

There is a passage in the 12th of Matthew, the 31st and 32d verses, which has been contended for as an unanswerable objection to universal salvation. The text reads thus, "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him neither in this world, nor in the world to come." The common idea of *this world and the world to come*, is the present life of man on earth, and that state in which man exists hereafter. Could it be proved, that this was the right meaning of the word, *world*, there would be somethnig *more in the* text than I can now see. Some, who

ıave ably defended the doctrine of universal sal-
vation, have admitted the common idea of the pas-
ıage, so far as it goes to prove future misery, yet,
ıave abundantly proved, that it would come to an
end: But if the word *world*, have the signification
of *age*, or *dispensation*, as will not be disputed,
t will be impossible to prove, that any thing, be-
yond what may be experienced by men, in this
nortal state, was intended, in this text. We are
nformed, that Christ came once in the *end* of the
world, to put away sin, by the sacrifice of him-
self. The *world*, in the end of which Christ
came, was undoubtedly the *dispensation* of the le-
gal priesthood; according to which idea, the *world*,
which was then to come, is the dispensation of
gospel light which rose on the Gentile world, for
he purpose of bringing them to the knowledge and
worship of the true God; which dispensation ends
with the conversion of the fulness of the Gentiles,
and will be succeeded by that in which Israel will
be visited by the spirit of their Messiah, and
shall say, Blessed is he who cometh in the name
of the Lord.

What I have written on this subject will show
he reader the propriety of supposing, that the *sin*,
which the pharisees committed, in blaspheming the
Holy Spirit, by which Christ wrought miracles,
ıas been visited upon their descendants even to
his day, and will continue upon them, until the
'ulness of the Gentiles be come in. But I see no
ıeed of carrying the meaning of these words to an
endless eternity, or even beyond the experience of
nan in this natural life. Therefore, admitting
he doctrine of future punishment true, I cannot
see it proved, from these words.

Could it be proved, that eternal or endless mis-

ery was a natural production of the divine nature, there being an unchangeable principle to support such misery; the argument, on my part, must be given up. If sin be, in a moral sense, the cause of misery; should sin ever be brought to an end, its consequences, which are misery, would also come to an end. If my opponent can tell me how Jesus will *finish sin*, and make an *end* of transgression, and yet sin and transgression continue as long as God exists, he will puzzle me more than all his objections have been able to do.

Having answered, as I hope, to the reader's satisfaction, some of the most important objections against God's universal goodness to his creatures, I shall now turn on the other hand, and give the reader some of my evidences for believing in the so much despised doctrine of universal holiness and happiness. First, I reason from the nature of divine goodness; in which all pretend to believe, and none dare, in a direct sense, to deny, that God could not, consistent with himself, create a being that would experience more *misery* than *happiness*. Secondly, if God be infinitely good, his goodness is commensurate with his power and knowledge; then, all beings whom his power produced, are the objects of his goodness; and to prove, that any being was destitute of it, would prove, that Deity's knowledge did not comprehend such being. Thirdly, there is as much propriety, in saying, that God is *infinite* in *power*, but that he did not create *all* things; as there is, in saying, though God be infinite in goodness, yet, part of his creatures will never be the partakers of it. It might as well be said, that God is infinite in knowledge, and yet ignorant of the most part of events which are daily and hourly taking place; as to say, that

he is infinitely good, and yet only a few of his creatures were designed for happiness. Fourthly, if the Almighty, as we believe him to be, did not possess power sufficient to make all his creatures happy, it was not an act of goodness in him to create them. If he have that power, but possess no will for it, it makes a bad matter as much worse as is possible. I then reduce my opponent to the necessity of telling me, if those, whom he believes will be endlessly lost, be those whom God *could* save, but *would* not! or those whom he *would* save, but *could* not! if it be granted, that God has both power and will to save all men, it is granting all I want, for a foundation of my faith.

I would further argue, that, as man is constituted to enjoy happiness, on moral principles, (to the knowledge of which principles we come by degrees) it is as reasonable to believe that all men were intended to obtain a consummate knowledge of the moral principles of their nature, as that any of Adam's race were. There is not an individual of the whole family of man, who is perfectly satisfied with those enjoyments which earth and time afford him; the soul is constituted for nobler pleasures, which, to me, is an evidence that God has provided, for all men, some better things than can be found in earthly enjoyments, where we find but little except vanity and disappointment. There is an immortal desire, in every soul, for future existence and happiness: For the truth of this assertion I appeal to the consciences of my readers. Why should the Almighty implant this desire in us, if he never intended to satisfy it? Supposing a mother has the power of modifying the desires and appetite of her child, would she cause it to want that which she could not get for

it? Would she take pleasure in seeing her child pine for fruits which did not grow in the country where she lived, and which she could not get? Or, would she prefer the anguish of the child, to its happiness, when it was in her power to grant all it wanted? If such a mother were to be found, who would call her a godly woman? Could her child, thus tormented, rise up and call her blessed? No, surely, it could not.

I further argue, that, all wise, good, and examplary men, wish for the truth of the doctrine for which I contend; they earnestly pray for the salvation of all men, and do all in their power, by the grace of God, to dissuade men from sin, to the obedience of the gospel; they enlist willingly into the service of virtue, to endeavor to win proselytes to holiness; their object is the destruction of sin, and the advancement of righteousness; and they believe, and I think justly, that God will bless their labors.

None, but wicked men, would wish for the endless duration of sin; were it left to the carnal mind, it would wish for nothing but the privilege of drinking in iniquity forever. But those, who truly love God and holiness, desire, night and day, to overcome the vile propensities, of their own deceitful hearts, and pray for the reconciliation of others to *holiness* and *happiness*. Now, why should we suppose that God is more of the mind of the wicked, than of the righteous? If it be God's spirit in us, which causes us to pray for the destruction of sin, is it reasonable, to say, that this same spirit has determined that sin shall always exist? Are we not right, in judging of the nature and character of God, from the dictates of *his spirit* in us? If so, does this spirit teach us the

ssity of endless transgression and misery? I
ı the reader to keep in mind, that I hold sin
misery inseparably connected, and holiness
happiness so likewise.

further argüe, if any of the human race be end-
ly miserable, the whole must be, providing they
know it; for, reasoning from that spirit of be-
olence which is necessary to a conformity to
principles of holiness, I prove it impossible
ı well disposed man to see another in misery,
iout bearing a very sensible proportion of such
ery. If it be argued, that this idea is wrong,
that the spirit which dictates it, is of the evil
; I say, in answer, all good men in the world
it to be a truth; and no man ever exhibited
e of it than the Saviour of the world. Man is
ıtituted with powers of sympathy; and while
e principles last, he cannot enjoy *complete* hap-
ss, and see one of his fellow creatures in tor-
ıt. I mistrust some one will say, then *Christ*
ot completely happy, nor the saints who have
e before us. I have no objection to the obser-
on; but think I see a divine beauty in the
ı. I will query a little, on the subject. It is
erally believed, that Christ existed, before he
born in Bethlehem; and it is evident, from
scriptures, that he did. But I would inquire,
ıt was his situation? Was it a state of *complete*
piness? I think likely this question will gen-
ly be answered in the affirmative. Then I fur-
ask, had he no desire for the salvation of sin-
ı, before he came into our world? Here the
stion *must* be answered in the affirmative, let
other question be answered as it may; for, if
were not the case, why did he come for the
ress purpose of saving them? If he willed and

intended the salvation of mankind, and also determined to encounter all the sufferings that were finally laid upon him, in favor of so worthy an object, it is evident his happiness was not complete; neither do I believe it will be, until he shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied.

If any one should be so particular as to query, asking, if the Almighty himself be not desirous of the salvation of sinners; and if so, how can his happiness be complete? I answer, a being, to whom events do not take place in succession, nor time pass away, with whom an eternity is a present now, whose knowledge, is intuitive, and who can neither hope nor anticipate, can neither increase nor decrease in happiness. But when we speak of *God*, abstractedly, our words ought to be few and chosen.

I have, I think, sufficiently proved, in this work, that Jesus Christ is *a created*, dependent being, and that he stands at the head of the creation of man, &c. If I be right, in that idea, I think I may reasonably argue, that he is a being to whom events take place in succession, who hopes and anticipates, and who, for the joy set before him, endured the cross, and despised the shame. Therefore, until the great work of his mission is completed, I cannot conceive that his happiness will be *complete*. If it be argued, that Christ, when on the cross, said it was finished, and that, in a moral sense, he felt no more pain for sinners, I have a right to object, for I do not know what warrant the scripture gives, for believing *all* this argument. That the sufferings of Christ, as to answer the type of a sin-offering, were then ended, is a reasonable idea; but to suppose, that Christ was then dispossessed of that principle which caused *him to feel* for the woe of mankind, does not ap-

pear reasonable. I have no idea, that the glorious Captain of our salvation now suffers, as he did, when he said, "*My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?*" But I believe, that he, whose soul travailed for the redemption of man, now increases in joy, as the work of reconciliation is going on, to the destruction of sin, and the conversion of sinners. He has told us, that there is more joy, in the presence of the angels, over *one* sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance. I do not conceive, that one part of human nature can be made perfectly happy, while the rest are in misery. When St. Paul spake of those who died in faith, not having obtained the promise, he says, "God having provided some better things for us, that they, without us, could not be made perfect."

Those, who are the most devout on earth, are the most desirous for the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom, and the deliverance of themselves and their fellow men, from sin and misery. For the sake of a case, I will suppose a christian, to-day, is exercised with fervent desires for the reconciliation of sinners; at night, he dies. Do all these holy desires cease, at death? If they do not, but do continue, though the happiness of the soul be great, yet, it is, at least, capable of being enlarged, or increased, by the prosperity of the Redeemer's cause among men.

How the idea ever got place in the human mind, that, even fathers and mothers, in the world to come, would rejoice, to see their own offspring in endless flames and hopeless torments, I can hardly conceive; though the probability is, it was first invented, to shun, in theory, those difficulties not otherwise to be avoided. I wish to use this error as

prudently as possible; but I wish to have it rightly understood, and judged of impartially. Will perfect reconciliation to God have this effect? I know it is contended, that it will; but what evidence have we of it? Was not Christ reconciled, or in a state of conformity to God's law? Did he manifest joy, at the sufferings of mankind? When he looked on Jerusalem, that abominable city, and knew that its chiefs would be his murderers, when he spake of the dreadful calamities just ready to burst on their devoted heads, how did he feel? Streams of sorrow break from the eye of innocence; in his grief, he spake of their destruction, but prophecies of their seeing him again, when they should welcome him, saying, "*Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!*"

If perfect reconciliation to God will effect complete happiness at the sight of human misery, the more we are reconciled to God, the more satisfaction we should take in seeing our fellow creatures miserable! Then, those, who can look on men in distress with the least sorrow, are the most reconciled to divine goodness; and those who feel the most sorrow at the afflictions of their fellow men, are the most perverse and wicked! Some may say, heaven is entirely different from this world, and when we get there, we shall be totally changed from what we now are; therefore, it will not do to argue, what we shall be there, from what we ought to be here. Then the awful fact is, all we call goodness here, will be called badness there; and that which we call badness here, will be goodness there!

If the effects of moral holiness, in the world to come, should be different from what they are here, *I wish to be* informed on what moral principle

the change is made. If these things be so, the souls of the cruel need but little alteration, to prepare them for heaven, and that little laid out in making them what we should call worse. Such a heaven as this, does not, I hope, exist in the universe. My opponent will urge his argument still further, on this subject, and say, it is not the *misery* of the wicked that affords so much pleasure to those who are in heaven, but their *joy is increased*, in consequence of the *execution of justice*. This, however, is giving up what is contended for, viz. that every degree of misery will create thousands of degrees of happiness, because, could divine justice be as well understood, without this misery, as with it, the misery itself would do no good. I am willing to grant, that a good man will prefer the execution of justice, to his own private ease, or the *partial* happiness of a criminal. But how would a judge appear who should manifest joy and gladness, on pronouncing the sentence of death upon one of his fellow men? Who would not turn from such a court with disgust and deep abhorrence? To call such a circumstance an instance in which men have an occasion to rejoice, is a violation of our senses. I will say, for myself, I neither expect nor desire perfect happiness, while I see my fellow men in misery; I had rather be possessed of that *sympathy* which causes me to *feel* for *another*, than to *enjoy* an *unsocial pleasure* in a *frosty heaven* of *misanthropy!* Is it possible, that we should be *completely happy*, and see those in *misery* whom we *love?* No one will say we can. Are we not commanded to love our enemies? Can we be tru y happy and not love them? Surely we cannot; then how can we be completely happy, and see them miserable? A parent may be persuaded to

attend his child, while a surgeon performs an amputation; but with what acute feelings his heart is agitated! How eagerly would he inhale the pain, and make it his own, if it were possible? But there is something in all this, that is tolerable; he is in hopes of saving the life of his child: Were it not for his hopes, could he endure the sight? But what is all this compared with a parent viewing his child in endless flames! O, parents, what a blessed circumstance it is, that, when we are called to part with our children, on earth, we can mingle a little joy with the sorrow, in hoping they belong to the deathless family in heaven! If the good desires, which are found in the christian heart, are ever to be satisfied, universal subjection to the government of Christ will surely take place: If virtue ever gain an universal victory over sin and vice, universal holiness and happiness will be the consequence. Man exists on such a principle, as renders him capable of improving in knowledge and happiness, which he obtains by experience; and it is very evident, that, as the wheels of time move, man is fast advancing, which favors the idea, that, at some period, known to *Deity*, the desired haven will be obtained, in the acquisition of that wisdom which is from above.

When we send our children to school, it is for the purpose of learning that of which they are ignorant; and it is by degrees, that those sciences are obtained, which constitute them learned.—When a child first takes a quill in hand to write, he blunders, but does not blunder so as to imitate the copy, neither will two out of a thousand imitate each other.

Men begin their moral existence, in their separate capacity, in the same way; unacquainted with

kill of their divine preceptor, they err from
d rules, and differ from their fellow pupils.
and broils ensue, and sorrow and woe are
consequences. But as fast as they become
at, they conform to the divine rules of their
er, and learn, that their happiness consists in
g united. Happiness is the greatest object of
ational beings, and no one will follow any
cular object any longer than he thinks it sub-
ient to his main one. The reason why men
is, they think, and think erroneously, that
shall obtain more happiness in so doing, than
llowing the dictates of truth. But is it reas-
le to suppose, that the error will never be
overed? Will the sinner never find his mistake?
s, says my opposer, to his eternal confusion
endless misery! but stop a moment; if he find
mistake, he will abandon the object; and when
eases to sin, he begins to reform, and approx-
e towards holiness and happiness. I have suf-
ntly argued, that man cannot be miserable,
nsequence of moral condemnation, any long-
an he is, in a moral sense, a sinner. Then he
sin, endlessly, in order to be miserable so
; which if so, he will never find his mis-
, he will never learn that righteousness and
are more productive of happiness than sin.
I think it erroneous, to suppose, that a being,
is capable of learning any thing, cannot learn
time short of *eternity*, that it is better to do
t, than *wrong*. Should we argue, however,
that might, in some cases, be true, it would
roy the idea of complete and positive misery,
which my opponent contends. Complete mis-
would not admit of a prospect which could
inister the smallest *hope*; in which case, the

soul would have no object which could possibly induce it to action; then would the soul become inert, and its *existence* would be *destroyed*, and become not a subject of happiness, or misery.

I would argue again, from a reasonable idea, admitted by all, viz. that mankind, in their moral existence, originated in God. Why then do we deny his final assimilation with the fountain from whence he sprang? The streams and rivulets which water the hill-country, run in every direction, as the make of land occasions. They are stained with various mines and soils, through which they pass; but at last they find their entrance into the ocean, where their different courses are at an end, and they are tempered like the fountain which receives them. Though man, at present, forms an aspect similar to the waters in their various courses, yet, in the end of his race, I hope he will enjoy an union with his God, and with his fellows.

Having given a few hints, from the nature of moral beings, in favor of my general plan, I shall beg the attention of the reader to some evidences, from the scriptures of truth, in favor of universal holiness and happiness. The method I intend to pursue will be conclusive; for I am determined to admit no scripture as evidence, in this case, that needs any interpretation to cause it to mean what I wish to prove; therefore, I shall produce but a small part of the scriptures which I conceive have a direct meaning in favor of universalism.

It will not be doubted, that man was created in Christ, who, the apostle says, is the *head* of *every* man. To this point, I have already attended in this work, and sufficiently proved it. I have, also, argued, that the *formation* of man was *after his creation*, as appears from the account given in

esis. Now, what I wish to prove, from scrip-
, is a complete deliverance of the whole human-
rom mortality, and the governing power of the
of sin which is found in our members, to a re-
ıtement in the heavenly Adam of immortality,
re the law of the spirit of life will be the whole
ırning power, to which man will be subjected.
ems reasonable to conclude, that man, in a *spir-*
l sense, was created in *Christ*, the *heavenly na-*
, as his body was *formed* in *Adam* the *earthly*.
as all our *bodies* came from that *one formation*,
ll our *spirits* came from that *one creation*. As
by the *nature* of this one *formed* creature, that
ıre all brought into a state of *moral death*, so
ust be by the *spirit* of this one *created* man that
will be brought, finally, to the enjoyment of
itual life and *peace*. There is a passage in
ı iii. 20, 21, which reads very literally, in proof
ny argument. "And he shall send Jesus
ist, which before was preached unto you: whom
heaven must receive until the *times* of *resti-*
n of *all things*, which God hath spoken by the
th of *all* his holy prophets since the world be-
" Can there be any dispute, in the reader's
l, respecting the nature of this restitution?
l any one pretend, that this restitution is only
stating man in a state of probation? If that
ɔ the object of Christ's coming into our world,
ıat were intended by his death and resurrection,
not the work already done, when Peter spake
e words? Why then does he speak of the
s of restitution yet to come? Or, if this resti-
ın of *all* things only meant the restitution of
ɔr to the law, by the sufferings of Christ, I ask,
n, was this not also past, when Peter spake
e words? I cannot conceive, that a restitution

of man to any state which he has occupied, in flesh and blood, is worthy of the gospel plan; for it is said of man, in his earthly nature, his *best* estate is *vanity*. But if we view the plan of the restitution of all things, which is to be accomplished in the fulness of times, a restitution or restoration from mortality and sin, to a state of immortality and righteousness, it is consistent with scripture, and worthy of God. If my opponent, in his struggles, should say, *things* do not refer to *men*, I would ask, what the word *things*, does mean in scripture, when used as it is in the passage quoted? I cannot guess, to what he would apply it. I will quote two passages more, where the word is used; see Col. i. 20. "And (having made peace through the blood of his cross) by him to reconcile *all things* to himself, by him, I say, whether they be *things* in earth, or *things* in heaven." That the *things* to be reconciled are *men*, may be seen, by verse 21. "And you that were sometimes alienated and enemies in your minds by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." The way, in which Christ effected this work, is expressed in the 22d verse, "in the body of his flesh, through death, to present you holy, and unblamable, and unreprovable in his sight." Eph. i. 10. "That in the dispensation of the *fulness* of *times*, he might gather together *in one all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." The reader will do well to observe the similarity between the last quoted passage and that in Acts. *There*, it is said, "until the *times* of the *restitution* of *all things*," and *here*, it is said, "that in the dispensation of the fulness of *times*, he might gather together in one *all things* in Christ." The 11th verse says, "in whom also *we* have obtained an inheritance." No doubt can be entertained,

respecting the *things* to be restored and reconciled, and gathered together in Christ. There is part of the words of Peter which I quoted from Acts, which ought to be particularly noticed in order to cause those who have said, the doctrine for which I contend is a new doctrine, to consider whether they are right, in that matter. The words are these, "Which *God* hath spoken by the mouth of *all* his holy prophets, since the world began." If *all* God's holy prophets believed in the doctrine of the restitution of *all* things, I hardly think it is so modern as some pretend.

I will next call the attention of the reader to what the holy prophets have said, in support of the doctrine of the restitution of all things: But as their testimony stands on the promise of God to Abraham, which contains the fulness of the doctrine for which I contend, I will notice it, in the first place, as the sum of all which the prophets have said, concerning the coming of the Just One, and the glory of his kingdom; see Genesis xii. 3. "And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." This promise is expressed in chap. xxii. verse 18, thus, "And in thy *seed* shall *all* the nations of the earth be blessed." That there may be no dispute what this blessing is, and that the reader may see it to be *justification* through faith, see Gal. iii. 8. "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through *faith*, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." What a glorious foundation for hope is here. How blessed was Abraham when he rejoiced in the day of Jesus. How blessed were the prophets of the Lord who saw these things,

though afar off; the sight weaned their affections from all earthly things; they sought a city which hath *foundation*, whose builder and maker is God. O, thanks be to my God, since I can call thee so; the belief of this, thy promise, produces as much heaven as I am able to bear, while in the body. When Jacob blessed his sons, he spake of the coming of Shiloh, unto whom, saith he, shall the gathering of the people be; see Genesis xlix. 10. How exactly does this testimony of the patriarch agree with that of the apostle's; "Unto him shall the *gathering* of the *people* be," "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might *gather together* in *one all things* in *Christ*." We will hear what the prophet David, says, concerning the kingdom of Christ, Pslam lxxii. 11. "Yea, *all* kings shall fall down before him; *all nations* shall *serve* him." Verse 14. "He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence." Verse 17. "And men shall be blessed in him, *all* nations shall call him blessed." If any wish to argue, that David meant no other than Solomon, by the King's son, let them take notice of the 7th and 8th verses. "In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." The moon yet endures, but the reign of Solomon does not. The kingdom spoken of, in the text, was to be universal; but Solomon's was not. Let us take particular notice of the 11th verse. "Yea *all* kings shall fall down before him." Shall *all* the cruel tyrants of the earth bow down to him who was born in a stable? Shall *all* the haughty kings of proud and wealthy nations, bow down to him *whose chosen* companions when on earth were

poor fishermen? Will you, my opponent, say, this is a pleasing doctrine to the carnal mind? Herod, who caused the massacre in Bethlehem, in order to murder Christ in infancy, could hardly be persuaded that it was agreeable to his carnal mind to bow before Jesus, at the head of this little band of martyrs. No, carnal mind must be crucified before all this can be done.

Would it please the present kings of Europe, to tell them, to beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks, and to learn war no more? Would it be agreeable to their carnal, proud and haughty minds, to submit to the religion of the Saviour? Which of them would, in order to gratify carnal mindedness, abandon all his equipage, his horses and chariots of state, mount a forlorn *ass*, ride into an enemy's land, preach peace and salvation to his inveterate foes, die by cruel hands, and pray for his murderers in death? And can you believe that *all* the kings of the earth can bow down before the Saviour, with any more gratification to carnal mindedness, than they could imitate him, in his life and death? "*All nations* shall *serve* him." If *all* nations serve Christ, will they not all be blessed in him, according to the promise? I do not argue that any will be blessed in Christ, who do not serve him; but the text says, all nations *shall* serve him. Psalm xxxvii. 10. "For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be, yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." Verse 36. "Yet he passed away, and he was not, yea I sought him, but he could not be found." If the wicked continue in sin as long as God exists, it appears to me to be improper to say, yet a *little* while, and the *wicked* shall not *be*. And if God have prepared a *place* of

endless torments for the *wicked*, and that in *sight* of the *righteous* in heaven, it is hardly proper to say, thou shalt diligently consider his *place*, and it shall not *be*. And if the wicked are to be tormented forever, in sight of the righteous, why is it said, "I sought him but he could not be found?" Psalm xxii. 27. "*All* the ends of the world shall *remember* and *turn* unto the Lord, and all the *kindreds* of the nations shall worship before thee." Who will doubt the salvation of those who *turn* unto the Lord and worship before him? See Psalm ii. 7, 8. "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Compare this beautiful passage with one like it in Col. i. 19. "For it pleased the Father, that in him should *all fulness dwell*." In what a capacious Saviour did David believe! Should a preacher, at the present day, recite the words which I have just quoted, he would immediately be accused of holding the heretical doctrine of *universal salvation*, as his hearers might be pleased to call it; or, should he communicate the doctrine half as clearly as it is communicated in those quotations, that part of his audience who were warmly opposed to the doctrine would grow uneasy, while those who favored the doctrine, would be satisfied their speaker did so likewise. Some method must be used to explain those scriptures differently from what they say, or the doctrine for which I contend is fairly proved by them.

Let us pass to the prophecies of Isaiah; see chap. xxv. 6, 7, 8. "And in this mountain shall the *Lord of hosts* make unto *all* people a feast of fat

ings, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things
ll of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined.
nd he will destroy in this mountain the *face* of
e *covering* cast over *all people*, and the veil that
spread over *all* nations. He will swallow up
ath in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away
ars from off all faces; and the rebuke of his
ople shall be taken away from off *all* the earth:
r the Lord hath spoken it." No one will doubt,
at the provisions here spoken of are those which
e provided in the gospel of salvation.

In the first place, then, observe, it is made for
l people; this proves, that it was the intention
him who made the feast, that *all* people should
are of its divine benefits.

2dly. It is testified, that the veil of darkness,
hich was over *all* people, should finally be taken
way.

3dly. That death is to be swallowed up in vic-
ry and tears wiped from off *all faces*. And,

Lastly. That the rebuke of God's people should
e taken from off *all* the *earth*. And the evidence
iven to prove it would all be done, is, the Lord
ath spoken it.

It is of no avail, for any to pretend that though
e provisions of the gospel were provided for *all*
eople, yet, *all* will not partake of them, let the
asons be what they may; for, if God wipe tears
om off *all* faces, *all* must receive the benefits of
ospel grace and peace. Compare this testimony
ith 1 Cor. xv. 54. "So when this corruptible
hall have put on incorruption, and this mortal
hall put on immortality, then shall be brought to
ass the saying that is written, death is swallow-
d up in victory." Again, with Rev. xxi. 4.
"And God shall wipe away *all* tears from their

eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away." How can it be justly said, that death is swallowed up in victory, when the fact is, death will reign as long as God exists? Or, how can it be said, that God shall wipe *all* tears from the eyes of men, if millions are to mourn to an endless eternity? Or, why is it said, there shall be no more sorrow, crying nor pain, if sorrow, crying and infinite pain, are never to cease? Isaiah ix. 6, 7, the Saviour is prophecied of, as possessing a kingdom, the increase of which should have no end. To the same purpose, see also Daniel vii. 14. "And there was given him *dominion*, and *glory*, and a kingdom, that *all people*, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

Observe, "*All people, nations*, and languages, *shall serve him*." If a great part of the human race are to exist in endless rebellion against Christ and his kingdom, it seems that the prophet was not only ignorant of it, but believed the reverse. Isaiah xlix. 6. "And he said, it is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my *salvation* unto the ends of the earth." Verse 8. "I will preserve thee, and give thee for a *covenant* of the people," &c.

For the strength of this *covenant* see Jer. xxxiii. 20. "Thus saith the Lord; if ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night

in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant," &c.

When men are possessed of sufficient *agency* to stop the wheels of time, to silence the motion of the solar system, and to disannul God's covenant with day and night, then day and night will depend on the *will* of man. So, likewise, when he has *agency* to disannul that covenant which is ordered, and in *all things* sure, then his eternal salvation will depend on himself, and not on his God.

Attend to one similitude of the Redeemer's glory from the prophecy of Ezekiel xvii. last paragraph. "Thus saith the Lord God, I will also take of the highest branch of the high cedar, and will set it; I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one, and will plant it upon a high mountain and eminent: in the mountain of the height of Israel will I plant it: and it shall bring forth boughs and bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar: and under it shall dwell all fowl of every wing; in the shadow of the branches thereof shall they dwell. And all the trees of the field shall know that I the Lord have brought down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, have dried up the green tree, and have made the dry tree to flourish: I the Lord have spoken, and have done it." Time would fail me to write one half that might be quoted from the prophets, on this subject. I ask for no explanation, on their testimony; if what they say, do not prove my doctrine, I will not have recourse to explanations.

I have reasoned, from the goodness of God, to prove, that it is his will, that all men should, finally, be holy and happy; I will now call proof from divine revelation, to the same idea; see St. Paul's 1st Epistle to Timothy ii. 4. "Who will have *all*

men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." What could induce St. Paul to write this sentence if he did not believe it? My opponent will say, he supposes Paul did believe it, and will acknowledge he believes it himself. Then, I say, all, for which I argue, is granted. But my opponent has a *method* by which he can *explain* this passage so that it may be true, and yet God may *will* the endless misery of millions. It is only to say, that the passage is expressive of God's *revealed will*, but not of his *secret will*; arguing, that his *revealed will* is in *direct opposition* to a *will* which he has seen fit not to reveal!

Though much use is made of this method, in order to shun the force of this passage and many others, if there be any propriety in it, it is out of my sight; or, if it would not betray a want of good sense, in any other case, I will leave my reader to judge.

To say, God's *revealed will* is contrary to his eternal and unrevealed will, would, in me, be blasphemy of the first magnitude; yet, I do not doubt the sincerity of those who frequently say it. But is it not in a direct sense charging God with hypocrisy? However shocking it may seem, I know of no other light in which to view it.

Again, if God have a will which he has not revealed, and my opponent knows what it is, I would ask how he came by this knowledge? God's revealed will is, that *all* men should be saved; but his *secret* will is, that most of them should be endlessly miserable! I would ask, when this will was a secret? It has been openly talked of, by *limitarians*, ever since the light of the gospel advanced so as to discover the apostacy of christians.

St. Paul speaks of the mystery of God's will which he proposed in himself, which, the apostle says, God has made known; see Eph. i. 9. "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in himself." And in verse 10, he tells what this *will* is; but it is very different from what my opposer says the *hidden* will of God is; "That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one *all* things in Christ, both which are in Heaven and which are on earth, even in him." St Peter says, God is not willing that any should *perish*, but that all should come unto repentance.

In short, I cannot see the propriety of saying that God *will* have *all* men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth, if he predestinated, from all eternity, millions for endless misery; and if he created any to glorify him, in endless torments, I cannot see why he should not be willing for them to perish, and answer the end for which he made them.

Again, what is that truth, which God wills *all* men to know? According to the words of the text, it must be a truth consonant to their salvation, or they could not be saved, and yet believe the truth. For instance, suppose, out of the whole alphabet, all are to be endlessly miserable, except the *vowel* letters, and the whole alphabet was brought to the knowledge of the truth; surely the vowels would believe they were to be saved, but all the consonants would believe they were going into endless torments; and the faith of the consonants would be as *true* a faith, as that of the vowels; but how could the consonants enjoy salvation while possessing this faith?

There are some who do not admit my general system, who will admit this part of it, viz. that it is the *will* of God, that all men should finally be holy and happy; but say, at the same time, that it depends on the creature's accepting of offered mercy, on the rational conditions of gospel obedience; making gospel obedience a prerequisition to salvation; while I contend, that gospel obedience is, in fact, gospel salvation.

To be saved from sin is, surely, a gospel salvation; and to be obedient, according to the dictates of gospel grace, is salvation from sin. There is just as much propriety in making obedience a condition, on which salvation is granted, as there would be for a physician to propose, to a patient in a fit of the asthma, that he would afford relief, on condition the patient should first breathe easy! However, if it be granted, that it is God's *will* that *all* men should, finally, be holy and happy, I will more directly answer the supposition, that this *will* may fail, by the words of St. Paul; see Eph. i. 11. "In whom we also have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated, according to the purpose of him, who worketh *all things* after the *council* of his *own will*." If God will have all men to be saved, and worketh *all things* after the council of his *own will*, it proves that for which I contend, as fully as any thing can be proved from scripture. My opponent perhaps will say, (as many have said to me in conversation) after meeting with much difficulty in arguing, "any thing may be proved, by scripture." To which, I reply, there is one thing, that the scriptures do not prove, neither can *all* the ingenuity of man make them substantiate it, and that is, the *endless misery* of a *moral being*.

any of my opposers can prove, by scripture, *dless* duration of sin and misery, as plainly two passages above recited prove universal ss and happiness, I will never contend any on the subject.

ill take further notice of Paul's communica- Timothy. He goes on, in the 5th and 6th , to give Timothy a reason for what he had ed; "For there is one God, and one Me- between God and men, the man Christ Je- ho gave himself a ransom for *all*, to be testi- due time." The apostle's reasoning is ev- y good and plain; for God would not have his Son a *ransom* for *all*, if it were not his at *all* should be saved; and if it be God's t ought to be ours, therefore, it is right to for *all*. If the ransom were paid for *all*, it , that it was the intention of the Ransom- t *all* should be benefitted.

at would have been the astonishment of the , after the immortal Washington had caused paid a ransom for *all* the American prisoners ere in Algerine slavery, if he had told the hat he did not want more than one quarter se captives sent home to the land of liberty the enjoyment of their families, for which ad so long sighed in bondage; and that he wear out the rest with fatigue and whips? e good man's soul was never satisfied until *ll* came home, and with songs of joyous lib- ailed the land of their nativity! And bless- the Captain of our salvation; he, also, see of the travail of his soul and be satisfi- hen *all* the "ransomed of the Lord shall re- nd come to Zion, with songs and everlast- ys upon their heads, when they shall obtain

joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

The reader's attention is now invited to those scriptures which, in *expression*, are more particularly applicable to the deliverance of mankind from this bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

The whole of the 15th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, was intended to refute those who denied the resurrection; but as that doctrine is not denied by my opponent, I shall take notice only of those parts which affect the argument between us; see verse 20. "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the *first fruits* of them that slept." Christ, as the first fruits of them who slept, is represented by the heave-offering under the law. See Num. xv. 19, 20. "Then it shall be that, when ye eat of the bread of the land, ye shall offer up an heave-offering unto the Lord. Ye shall offer up a cake of the first of your dough, for an heave-offering: as ye do the heave-offering of the threshing floor, so shall ye heave it." Exodus xxii. 29. "Thou shalt not delay to offer the first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors; the first born of thy sons shalt thou give unto me." See also, Numbers xviii. 15. By the offering of the first ripe fruits, the whole of the succeeding harvest was sanctified; and in the first born which were redeemed, the succeeding fruits of the womb were considered holy; see Acts xxvi. 23. "That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead." Christ being the first who rose from the dead, and rising as the first fruits, sanctifies *all* the rest, as did the first fruits under the law. St. Paul's comment on first fruits, is very illustrative of the scriptural meaning there-

of; see Rom. ix. 16. "For if the first fruits be holy, the lump is also holy; and if the root be holy, so are the branches.

In the heave-offering under the law, there is a beautiful representation of our Saviour. The sheaf taken from the field, being separated from *all* the rest of the same growth, represents the separation of Jesus Christ from mankind to be holy unto the Lord; and the sanctification of the whole harvest being by the first ripe fruits, is to shew us, that our sanctification is in Jesus, the first fruits of them that slept. The same may be clearly seen, in the instance of the dough; a certain part of it was to be separated from the rest, for an offering unto the Lord, in which the remaining part of the *lump* (as the apostle calls it) was considered holy.

These observations are made here, in order to draw the reader's attention more closely to the labors of the apostle, which we have under consideration; for he goes on immediately to show what he means, by the *lump* spoken of in Romans; see verse 21. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead."

Let me here observe, that death came by the earthly man, and the resurrection came by the heavenly man, which is in point to prove, that the plan of the gospel is to deliver mankind from the earthly Adam, to the immortality of the heavenly.

Perhaps none would dispute what I here contend for, provided I did not extend the cure as extensive as the malady; but I shall also contend for this, and will clearly prove it by the apostle's testimony; see verse 22. "For as in Adam *all die, even so in Christ,* shall *all* be made *alive.*" It is not possible for me to state the doctrine more *con-*

cise and *positive* than the apostle has done, in the passage quoted. But I am willing to attend to my opponent's objections as I proceed. He will say, he does not dispute that the apostle here meant *all* mankind, but that he only intended they would *all* be raised from the dead, not that *all* would be delivered from condemnation and sin. But I will rest my argument on the words themselves; I say, if *all* men are made *alive in* Christ, they cannot be said to be *out* of Christ dead, or alive, sinful, or holy.

The present state of our being is derived from Adam, the earthly nature; and, in a natural sense, we are *all in him.* Our future state of existence, we derive entirely from the heavenly nature; and, therefore, it is said, *all* shall be made alive in Christ. The apostle goes on still further, to show the order of the before mentioned work, arguing, from the *first fruits,* the *whole family of mankind.* See 1 Cor. xv. 23, 24, 25. "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father: when he shall have put down *all* rule, and *all* authority, and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet." Christ is here again spoken of as the first fruits, in the order of the resurrection, which consists of *three* parts.

First. Of Christ himself, who was the first that rose from the dead.

Secondly. Those who are Christ's at his coming, which coming I will not endeavor to point out, as it makes nothing, in respect to the particular argument in which I am at present engaged.

Thirdly. The coming of the end, which cannot be, until he hath put down *all* rule, authority and power, and *every enemy* has submitted; at which time, the Mediator delivers up the kingdom to God, the Father.

Then shall the great work of reconciliation be finished, and the labors of the Redeemer completed, with immortal honor. Then shall *all* the millions of the human race be reconciled to God, through Christ, and shall sing; see Rev. v. 11, 12, 13, 14. "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; singing with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessings. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and *all* that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever. And the four beasts said, amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down, and worshipped him that liveth forever and ever."

The reader will observe, that ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands of *angels*, *beasts* and *elders*, first declare the Lamb, who had been slain, to be worthy to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessings; then *every* creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and *all* that are in them, say, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him who sitteth upon the

throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever. Then the elders and beasts, who first pronounced him thus worthy, fell down and worshipped him who liveth forever and ever.

There is nothing, in all the sacred writings, more astonishingly beautiful, than this account; neither do I think it possible for the imagination to paint any thing half so grand and sublime. I am all astonishment! To realize, by faith, the accomplishment of this glorious prediction, transcends every other thought, or idea, of which the mind is susceptible.

There is no room for my opponent to argue, against the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness, while this passage of divine truth lies in sight. There are no expressions left out of this passage that would make it more extensive.

May I not ask my opposer if he be not willing to acknowledge what mysterious powers have acknowledged, that Christ, the dear Lamb who hath been slain, is worthy to receive as extensive worship as is declared in the passage quoted?

When the four beasts and the elders saw universal nature bending before the object of their worship, they immediately fell down, anxious to excel, and worshipped him who liveth forever and ever. If my opponent think Christ is not worthy of so much worship, he thinks less of him than *I* do, and less than I wish *he* did.

There are yet remaining many passages in the 15th of Corinthians, which are in point, to prove what I am contending for, even more than is, at this time, necessary to introduce. A few more, however, may be proper, with some few remarks. See verse 28. "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be

ect to him that did put all things under him, God may be all in all."

'hat must we understand by all things being *ued* unto him? Will any one say, all that is it by it, is, Christ will then have power over ien, whereby he can reward the righteous, and ent the wicked? When did he not possess power? When were not all things in subjec- to Christ, enough for those purposes? The ection of all things to Christ must mean some- ;, and it is reasonable to believe, that it means 'econciliation of the heart to holiness. Can a in sin, employed in blaspheming the Incom- icable Name, be said to be in subjection to st, in any way that answers to the text? I do think any will contend for it.

he only subjection which is acceptable to st, is a broken and contrite heart, which he not despise. The plan then of the gospel, iiversal submission to Christ, in holiness and iiness.

he delivery of the kingdom of Christ to the Fa- is declared, in the last clause of the passage ed, of which I have before taken notice, in this ;, in order to show the dependence of Christ on Eternal and Self existent. Then, it is said, id shall be *all* in *all*." In what sense will God *ll* in *all*, at the close of the Redeemer's process he is not now, or always was? Answer, he dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in . When *all* men are brought to love God su- iely, and their fellow creatures as themselves, ll then be manifest, that we are nothing only e exist in God; therefore, God will be *all*. as the eternal spirit of love, which is the irning principle of the heavenly man, will be

the governing principle of each soul thus reconciled to the law of love, it may justly be said that God is *in all.* See verses 47, 48, 49. "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." As we have all been partakers of the earthy Adam, so the apostle argues, we shall be partakers, in the resurrection, of the Second Adam, whom he calls the Lord from heaven. See verses 51, 52, 53, 54. "Behold, I will shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall *all* be changed, in moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory."

If death, sin and sorrow, are to remain, as long as God exists, how can it be said, death is swallowed up in victory? If the apostle believed any part of the family of man would finally be excluded from the blessings of the gospel, why did he not just hint something of it, in this account of the close of the Mediatorial kingdom? Did he consider it a matter of *too small moment* to *mention?* If he *did,* he is *inexcusable* for precluding the idea, by *plain* and *positive testimony.* See his conclusion, "O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the

strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." If sin remain without end, it being the *sting* of death, when the question is asked, O death, where is thy *sting?* Sin may answer, here I am and here I will be, in spite of him who undertook to destroy the works of the devil, and here I will boast of my power as long as he does of his, whom angels adore, and I hate! Phil. iii. 21. "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able *even* to subdue *all things* unto himself." Observe, who shall change our vile body. In a former quotation, it is said, "we shall *all* be changed;" and in the present passage, it is said, "whereby he is able even to subdue *all things* unto himself." In a former quotation, it is said, "And when *all things* shall be *subdued* unto him."

Let us hear what our blessed Lord himself says, in respect to his mission. St. John v. 22, 23. "For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that *all* men should *honor* the *Son*, even as they *honor* the *Father*. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father, which hath sent him." In the sense in which this passage was spoken, it is evident, that the sinner does neither honor the Father, nor the Son, and the plain testimony of the text is, that *all men* should honor both. Compare this with Philip. ii. 9, 10, 11. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above *every* name; that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven, and *things* in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus

Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." As, in the other passage, the exaltation of the Saviour, is first spoken of, and then the grand intention, in his exaltation, shown; so in this; there, it is for the purpose that *all* men should honor him; and here, it is, that unto him, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Of this glorious and soul-reviving truth, the prophet Isaiah was not ignorant, but speaks of it most clearly; see chap. xlv. 22, 23, 24, 25. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear. Surely, shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength: *even* to him shall come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory." The reader will observe, I have left out some supplied words, in the above quotation, by which, the passage reads without ambiguity.

Had the inspired prophet been possessed of an accurate knowledge of the dispute in which I am engaged, I do not see how he could have written a sentence more pertinently to my argument; and I have not a doubt but the Spirit intended the passage for the same purpose for which I have used it.

St. Paul, in the viiith of Romans, shows the extent of redemption in so strong terms as to ad-

ıit of no possible evasion; see verses 22, 23. "For 'e know that the *whole creation* groaneth, and availeth in pain together until now. And not nly they, but ourselves also, which have the first ruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan with- ı ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the edemption of our body."

If the reader will be at the trouble of examin- ıg this passage, with its connexion, that, for vhich I contend, will appear plainly proved by it.

There is no end to proofs of universal reconcil- ıtion to God; for every thing of a moral nature estifies it, and all material nature is a figure of it. The ministry of reconciliation, which, St. Paul ays, was committed to himself and others, is, that Iod was in Christ reconciling the *world* unto him- elf, not imputing unto them their trespasses. The truth of Christ's dying for *all* is the founda- ion of the apostle's argument on this subject; vhich truth the apostle says, he was constrained o believe, by the love of Christ; for thus saith ıe, "The love of Christ constraineth us; because ve thus judge, that if one died for all, then were ıll dead; and that he died for *all*, that they which ive, should not henceforth live unto themselves, ıut unto him which died for them, and rose again," ; Cor. v. 14. &c.

I may as well stop here as any where, for as I ust said, there is no end; and if those scriptures, vhich I have quoted, be true, that, which I have ndeavored to prove, is proved; but if they be ıot, more of the same testimony would prove ıothing.

There is but one method left for my opponent, ıy which he can further oppose me; and that is ıy denying the whole system of divine revelation,

and man's susceptibility of rational ideas: But as that would equally destroy all for which he would contend, he will undoubtedly be cautious.

We now see clearly, that it is God's will, according to his eternal purpose, purposed in himself, that *all* men should finally be *holy* and *happy*; that it was the intention of the Saviour's mission; that the prophets, by the spirit of prophecy, long foresaw this universal and godlike glorious plan of grace; that every good principle in man stands up in testimony of so divine a system, that the happiness of all moral beings is wrapped up in the glorious issue of the ministration of reconciliation, and that it is, in reality, opposed by none, but by *unreconciled* beings, unholy principles, and unlawful desires. And shall we say, the eternal good will of him who dwelt in the bush, must fail at last? Must the testimony of the prophets fall to the ground? Must the captain of our salvation, who warred in righteousness, who reddened his garments in his own blood, who bore the sins of the world, and suffered death in agony, to obtain his lawful inheritance, be robbed of them at last? Were this believed in heaven, the royal diadem would fall from the head of him whom all heaven adores, and the highest arch angel would faint away! But blessed be the Lord, and blessed be his truth, its divine power shall cause the Leviathan of infidelity to bite the ground, shall rend the veil which is cast over all nations, and shall more and more manifest divine righteousness and the name in which it is found, in which name alone is salvation. In the days of the apostles, the greatest object in preaching the gospel of Christ, was to prove him to be the Saviour of the world, *the true* Messiah of the law, urging, that he died

for *all*, that he made no distinction between Jew and Gentile, but had broken down the partition-wall between them, for the glorious purpose of making, of the *twain*, *one new man* in everlasting fellowship and eternal peace. But how hath the gold changed, how hath the most fine gold become dim! The main apparent object, at the present day, is to prove the object of the Saviour's mission, as it respects the salvation of sinners, extremely limited, and that but few of the human race will finally be the redeemed of the Lord to the praise of his glory; that the great adversary of righteousness will obtain a much larger conquest of souls than Christ himself; and, O, shocking to name, eternal justice is profaned, by being called to assist the serpent's designs, in the endless duration of sin and rebellion against God! Those, whom the Lord hath blessed with a belief of universal holiness and happiness, are proscribed as heretics, infidels, offscourings of the earth, friends to nothing but sin, and enemies to nothing but *God* and *holiness;* opening a door to licentiousness of every abominable species, destroyers of the pure religion of Christ, and nuisances to society. But is it, in reality, manifesting a love to sin, to argue its total destruction, by the power of divine righteousness? Is it manifesting enmity against God and the religion of Jesus, to contend for the propriety of all men's serving him, in *holiness* and *happiness?* And are we nuisances to society, because we endeavor to pursuade all men to love God and one another? Can these things be displeasing to him who was born in Bethlehem? Will he not rather greatly bless such labors, though performed by those as little esteemed in the world

as were the poor fishermen who left their nets, and followed the despised Nazarene?

Let us ask a few questions. Which reflects the most honor on the Divine character, to contend, it was necessary for him to create millions of rational creatures to hate him, and every divine communication he makes to them, to all eternity, to live in endless rebellion against him, and endure inconceivable torments, as long as God exists; or to suppose him able and willing to make all his rational creatures love and adore him, yield obedience to his divine law, and exist in union and happiness with himself?

Which reflects most honor on the Saviour, to say, that but few will obtain salvation by him; and though he died for all men, yet, his death will benefit but few; or, to say, with the prophet, "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied, having reconciled all things to God, through the peace made by the blood of the cross?

If there be joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance, which would yield the most joy to the heavenly hosts, the repentance of one fourth of mankind, or the whole? If the servants of Christ here on earth desire the *increase* of *holiness* and the *decrease* of *sin*, which would be most agreeable to such a desire, the belief, that the greatest part of mankind will grow *more* and *more sinful* to *all eternity;* or, to believe, that *sin* will continually *decrease*, and *righteousness increase*, until the *former* is wholly *destroyed*, and the *latter* becomes *universal?*

To answer the above questions, so as to favor my opponent's argument, is more than any one would be willing to do; and which, if done,

would involve an endless train of ideas too glaringly absurd to be supported. But to answer them, agreeably to the nature of divine truth, opens to infinite beauties, more serene than the morning, and more glorious than the noon day. God, the fountain of living waters, and the essence of eternal life, is seen, by faith in Jesus, the same to all rational beings, the author, supporter and blesser of them. Christ Jesus, the head of every man, is beheld as the brightness of the Father's glory, and express image of his person, through whom the Eternal hath manifested the riches of his grace, the eternal councils of his love to the world, brought life and immortality to light, and manifested our eternal sonship in the Second Adam. Each holy desire, as the fruit of the Spirit, in the souls of those who believe, feasts on the rich promises of Abraham's God, believing him faithful who hath promised. Heaven hath already received the heave offering of the first ripe fruits, and the fields are white, ready to harvest. O, ye laborers in the vineyard of the Lord, be ye not idle. What an extensive field is here in which for the mind to expand and send its desires abroad! The transcendant beauties of salvation have visited the dark regions of mortality, as light and heat from the vernal sun visits the cold and dark north, turning frozen lands into fruitful fields, taking the icy fetters from limpid streams which bend their course to the fountain, bringing the time of the singing of birds, and causing the voice of the turtle to be heard.

"I am come," says Jesus, "to send a fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?" All the passages, which allude to a dispensation of fire, which I have observed, in this work, are di-

rect evidences, to prove the destruction of sin and all sinful works, the purification of sinners, and their eternal reconciliation to holiness and happiness. This fire will either overcome sin, or be overcome by it: But who will argue the latter? If none, then let the former be acknowledged. If you say, these things appear differently from what you expected they would, before your enquiry, and you find something more interesting than tradition has taught you; if you feel soft, in your mind, towards the so much despised doctrine of universal holiness and happiness; if you can believe heaven large enough to contain mankind, and begin to breathe in the air of unbounded benevolence, and feel faith mingled with your desires for the destruction of sin, and the increase of holiness, then come still further. The knowledge of these things is *progressive*, and *obtained only by degrees.* I give you my hand, in token of love and friendship; and my heart in all faithfulness, is yours. Let us still go on and view the heavenly beauties yet to be unfolded, in the plan of the gospel. I well know there are many difficulties to be surmounted; to profess universal salvation, will subject some to excommunication from regular churches; others to the pain of being neglected by their neighbors; others to be violently opposed by their companions; and, in many instances, undoubtedly, the father will be against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; and a man's enemies may be those of his own house: But can such difficulties excuse us for not owning him, who, for us, bore the cross and despised the shame? All denominations, since the *world began*, have experienced some difficulties in

their first establishment. Christ and his apostles wrestled hard, and encountered great opposition, even to the loss of all earthly things, with life itself. Since the apostacy, the denominations which arose out of Popery, have, in thousands of instances, suffered more than duty calls us to suffer, in a land of liberty and toleration. But some will say, there are none who profess the doctrine in my vicinity, except some of the lower class of people; and if I rank myself with them, my titles of honor will do me no good, and my road to the temple of fame will be forever intercepted. Some will say to themselves, I must believe the doctrine, I cannot argue against it, but I will say nothing about it, lest I should be mistrusted; I would gladly embrace the opportunity which Nicodemus did, who went to Jesus by night; but to come out boldly, to the knowledge of the world, is too great a sacrifice. Says another I am convinced of the truth of the doctrine, but I have preached so much against it, have warned my hearers so much to shun that heresy, I am now ashamed to tell them I believe it. Another feels so dependent on his neighbors, he wishes to have them go forward first. All these circumstances, and many more, bear great weight with various persons, in various circumstances, causing great labor of mind; and those who are under such influences may be said to be heavy ladened. I know of no better remedy for those cases, than an attention to the exhortation of Christ, who said, "Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest; take my yoke upon you, learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and you shall find rest unto your souls; for my yoke is easy and my burden is light."

The reader may judge, from those circumstances, whether this doctrine be pleasing to the carnal mind, as its enemies say. Was it pleasing to the pharisees of old to be taught, by Christ and his disciples, that publicans and harlots should enter the kingdom of heaven before them? Yes, just as pleasing to their carnal minds, as it is to a professed preacher of Christ, who can thank God that he is better than other men, to tell him that those, upon whom he looks as much viler than himself, stand in no more need of pardon than he does. St. Paul, before his conversion to christianity, undoubtedly looked on the doctrine of Christ to be exactly calculated to please wicked men, as the most part of those who were discipled by it, were publicans and sinners; and he well knew, that the *foundation* of their *hope* was the *forgiveness* of *sin*. This he despised, as did many of his equals in the Jewish religion; feeling themselves whole, they felt no need of a physician. They supposed the gospel to be a doctrine every way calculated to vitiate and immoralize mankind. Undoubtedly the pharisees often said, of the disciples of Christ, their religion is perfectly suited to their characters; they are sinners, and know not the law; and they have contrived a *very easy way* to get to heaven. But if we ask St. Paul, after his conversion, what he thought of these things, he would undoubtedly give a very different account. For when the Lord met him in the way, and gave him to understand his real character, and what he was doing; he was astonished, and fell to the earth; his sins were set in order before him, and his soul was greatly troubled. In this situation, he learned the necessity of the doctrine which he had despised; *experienced* the necessity of its pardoning mercy;

and became as willing to endure persecution, for its sake, as he had been to persecute it before.

When it is understood, that gospel salvation is salvation from carnal mindedness and all its relative ills, to a reconciliation to the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus; if all men were thus saved, it would not be argued, that it is pleasing to the carnal mind. As the doctrine for which I contend, is entirely the reverse of carnal mindedness, so it is equally opposed to licentiousness; for what can be a stronger restraint on the passions than a belief in God's universal goodness, and that all men are the objects of his mercy? Such a belief, when it has its proper effects in the mind, raises a supreme affection for God, and kindles the sacred fire of love and unbounded benevolence to mankind. If any would dispute me, on my statement of the consequences of this faith, I have greatly the advantage; as my opponent does not possess this faith, he cannot tell the effects of it so well as one can who does. However, I will not make use of that advantage, having argument in my power that is more than sufficient. Let my adversary state his argument, that we may see the strength of it. The fact is, he has no argument; he can only *assert*, "the doctrine is not productive of love to God or man, but the reverse; and if he believed it, he would commit every sin that was in his power." Is it hard to see, that my opponent has made a very fair and full profession of his love to sin, in room of his love to God; and a strong desire to injure his fellow men, in room of serving them in love? What was the elder brother angry for? At what did he grumble? And why did he refuse to go into his father's house? Because the father had received the prod-

igal, and treated him kindly. At what did the laborers grumble who bore the burden and heat of the day? Because those, who had wrought but one hour, received as much as they, and received their money first. At what did the pharisees and scribes murmur, when they saw all the publicans and sinners come to Jesus to hear him? Because he did not condemn them to hopeless despair, but kindly received them. At what do my opposers rage? At what are they dissatisfied? Not because I exclude them from any privilege, or blessing of the gospel. What, then? I am sorry to name it. It is because I extend those blessings further, and hope they will do more good than what suits them!

As the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness opens an infinite field in which for the mind to expatiate, and learn the goodness of God in all his works and providence, it is the most animating to a benevolent soul of any that was ever believed, in our world, and lays the broadest foundation for exhortation to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, to live sober, righteous and godly lives. How strong are the inducements, from such glorious views of God and his mercy, to lead us to imitate such unbounded goodness, in all our intentions and actions. And being fully convinced, that our happiness is in union with our duty, those who fully believe in the consequences of atonement, as I have argued them, will see the propriety of my endeavoring to stir up their pure minds, by way of remembrance, exhorting them to good works in all faithfulness in whatever situation duty may call us, or whatever the part may be which our heavenly Father hath

alled us to act, in his divine and delightsome service. The duty enjoined on the believer of this octrine, is as much more extensive than the duty njoined by any other faith, as the faith itself is ore extensive; and its delights are so, likewise. f a poor man was offered a thousand pounds for day's labor, it would undoubtedly be a very trong inducement to him to labor. But it is to e observed, in this case, that it is not the *labor itelf* which is the object, but the *large sum of money* with which the laborer expects to be rewarded. t is not the *labor* in which the man delights; ould he obtain his *money*, without the *work*, it would be his choice. But when the *labor itself* is ll the *enjoyment*, and the *wholé object* is *obedience*, he laborer will not wish the *time short*, or the *duty small*; no, *eternity is none too long for the soul to contemplate laboring in the endless delights of obedience to his God.*

Those, who believe a future state of happiness depends on certain duties performed by them, undoubtedly intend to do those duties sometime before they die; and it is often said, that a procrastination of those duties, on which so much depends, is dangerous, as life is uncertain; yet, they had rather let it alone, until old age deprives them of the common comforts of life; at which time, they may about as well be employed in the *dull* and *disagreeable task* of being *good* as any thing else. But those, who consider their duty as their meat and drink, ought not to need much inviting, to feed on dainties so rich. We should hardly believe a man to be in his right mind, who, for eating a good meal of victuals, should charge the price of it. "*In* keeping thy commandments, there is *great reward*. By these observations, the

reader will see how needful it is for us, at all ti
to attend to our duty, because "*now* is the acc
ed time, and *now* is the day of salvation;" to
ery willing and obedient soul who feels the pe
of atoning grace, *salvation* is present: Truly
said of wisdom, "She hath builded her ho
she hath hewn out her seven pillars: she hath l
ed her beasts; she hath mingled her wine;
hath also furnished her table." God, in inf
wisdom, has constituted all moral beings so
their duty is their happiness, and strict obedi
fulness of joy. Why, then, my bretheren, shal
starve? Why live poor? Why should we b
parsimonious of those heavenly stores that
never be exhausted? "Blessed are they who h
ger and thirst after righteousness for they shal
filled." "Ask, and ye shall receive; seek, an
shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto yo
God forbids none; "the Spirit and the bride
come; and let him that heareth, say, come;
whoever will, let him take of the fountain of
water of life freely." Remember the salva
which God wills is a salvation *from sin*. Ther
much as you desire salvation, you will wis
avoid sin and wickedness. There are none
would say, they did not want salvation; but
many are there who say, they want it by their
conduct! No man, understandingly, wants sa
tion, any further than he wants more holin
The universalist, who is really so, prizes his
as his heaven, as his peace, and his most subl
enjoyment. How then shall we be so lost, so bl
and so deceived, as to wish to shun our duty
our happiness? If we really believe those thi
and desire that others may be brought to see
believe the same, let us endeavor, in the first pl

to prove to all men, that such a belief is of real service in cultivating our morals, and in regulating our behavior. And, secondly, by using our abilities as God hath given, in cool dispassionate reasoning, with those who do not believe; contending for nothing but the pure principles of love, in meekness and all gentleness. Never argue for *will* sake, nor for mastery: and, shunning every appearance of *sophistry*, never suffer yourselves to be anxious about the issue of conversation; but speak the words of truth and soberness, and leave the event to be directed by the spirit of God. Falsehood is so apt to detect itself, that an argument is generally best conducted, when the disputant is refuted by consequences arising from his own statements: and if he cannot see and understand them for himself, it will do no good to see them for him. If we can see for ourselves, we do well. If the Lord of the harvest hath graciously been pleased to call you by his grace, to preach the word of his gospel to his purchased possession; to sound abroad the trumpet of salvation, and to feed the sheep and lambs of the one true shepherd, then remember, that it is required of stewards that they are found faithful. St. Paul declared himself a debtor both to the Greeks and Barbarians, to the wise and the unwise. He having received a dispensation of the gospel, the grace of which belonged to *all* men, he thereby became a debtor to *all*. And if we have received a dispensation of the same gospel, we are debtor's to all whom this gospel concerns. How happy is a friend, who has good news to communicate to his companions: and surely it is an office much to be desired to carry good news to the distressed. See the officer when he reads a

pardon to one who expects immediate death: his soul bursts through his eyes in streams of joy, while he pronounces the words which give life to the dead. But how much more excellent are the labors of those whose feet are beautiful on the mountains, who publish peace in the Redeemer's name, even glad tidings unto all people. Much watchfulness is necessary, lest the law of the carnal or old man gets the government of the mind. I will venture to say, there never was a preacher more ready, on all occasions, than the old man which we are exhorted to put off; he is willing, at all times, to assist, never waiting to be called. He has no objections to preaching *about* Christ, if *Christ* be not preached. He is perfectly willing to say, that *salvation* is *all* of *God*, and that Christ is a whole Saviour; but then it is indispensably necessary that *he* should do something; such as asking, seeking, knocking; or, if it be only *accepting* of offered mercy, is all *he* wants. It may be, the reader will wonder a little at what I here say, as I have just quoted the exhortation, to ask, to seek, to knock, &c.; but I wish to be understood, that we must ask, seek and knock, not *in* the *name* or *nature* of the *earthly* Adam, but in the *name* and *nature* of the *heavenly* man. The old serpent, the devil, is never better pleased, than when he can do something which he thinks lays God under some obligation to him. If the carnal or old man get so baffled as to be reduced to give up his influence respecting our *eternal life* in *Jesus*, he will immediately propose, in his struggles, that all *he* can do, is to ensure a blessed state, for some considerable time after we die, say for a thousand years, or any given time; then all must depend *on the* Saviour. If the earthly Adam can get us

up Jacob's ladder a few steps, he is willing that Christ should do something by and by. Now the object of all those devices, of which we are not ignorant, (as St. Paul says) is to keep us in the service of the flesh; but remember, he that *soweth* to the *flesh*, shall of the *flesh* reap *corruption*. A pharisee, who feels as if something was coming to him more than others receive, perhaps will not be scrupulous about the exact quantity. He only wishes to have proper attention paid him; if he can flatter himself with a *higher seat* in *heaven* than those are to have, on whom he looks as worse than himself, it satisfies his carnal pride: Perhaps a period of punishment for sinners, after death, in which they may be justly corrected, for not being so good and holy as this pharisee, would give him much satisfaction. He would then be willing to have the poor wretches delivered from absolute misery, and enjoy some small conveniencies. O, how hard it is, to be a humble disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus. It is death to carnal mind. If I preach the gospel all my life long, spend all my time and strength for the good of mankind, and the honor of my Saviour, shall I not have something more hereafter, than one who has mocked and derided me? Answer, if I have, in truth and meekness, preached Christ, and have been faithful in his cause, ought I not to be thankful, that he has enabled me so to do? Have I been the loser, unless I am paid, in the world to come, by having some privilege granted me which another may not enjoy? O, blush, my soul, if thy follies rise so high. No, every moment's faithfulness has been supplied with streams of divine consolation; and it ought to be remembered, that the preacher never refreshes others, unless he him-

self is refreshed. If I have professed to preach Christ, but have preached myself, in room of him, undoubtedly I may think there is something coming, as my living has been very poor, while I have thus labored; but the truth is, my *reward* has been *equal* to my *service*. I am willing to acknowledge, that *carnal mind* often contends, that I have done so well, I ought, in consequence, to expect high approbations; and I begin to look *down* on those whom I fancy of less magnitude. But, O, the viperous sting! Well might an apostle say, "I find a law in my members warring against the law of my mind, bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." Says the same apostle, "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." Upon what high advantages did he calculate, above those who were much less in labor than himself? But, says the reader, will not St. Paul fare better than the worst of sinners, in eternity? Judge from what he says, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save *sinners*, of whom *I* am *chief*." The more humble we are, the greater our enjoyments. But when all are completely humbled, and perfectly reconciled; when all old things are done away, and all things become new; when he, who sitteth upon the throne, maketh all things new in deed and in truth, I believe all strife, concerning who shall be great in the kingdom of heaven, will be at an end. Ye, who preach righteousness in the great congregations of the people, forget not the exhortation of the Captain of our salvation, "*Learn of me*." What good will all our labors do,

unless we learn of Christ? If we learn of him, he will be unto us, wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption; and we shall preach, not ourselves, but Christ Jesus our Lord, and ourselves the servants of the people, for Jesus' sake. Remember, again, the exhortation of him who is the leader and commander of the people, "Search the scriptures." Make yourselves acquainted with, and have free recourse to, this great store-house of divine riches, that you may be ready to "deal a portion to seven, and also to eight." Ye are the salt of the earth." As salt preserves and seasons meats, so that they are acceptable, so ought the ministers of righteousness to endeavor, as far as possible, to preserve mankind from sin, that they may be acceptable members of the church of Christ. "But if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men." We cannot be profitable to others, unless we have the savor of the Spirit within us; this lost, and we are good for nothing; and in room of having a mouth, and wisdom, to put gainsayers to silence, we shall be overcome by them, and they will tread us under their feet. "Contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." But be sure to remember, that, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty through God." Carnal mind frequently urges the necessity of contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints; but then we must contend in a coat of *mail*, and with the weapons of him who sought the life of the *Son* of Jesse. Be prepared to meet every kind of opposition; we must be attacked on every side, the adversary will not leave one stone unturned, nor

a weapon in his armour, untried. Be cautious of any system of divinity; remember "the path of the just is a shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day." The moment we fancy ourselves *infallible*, every one must come to our peculiarities, or we cast them away. Even the truth may be held in unrighteousness. *Daniel's* God was undoubtedly the *true God;* but I do not conceive *Darius* any more the real friend of that *God*, when he made a decree that *all* people should worship him, than he was when he made the decree, that no petition should be asked of any God or man, for thirty days save of himself. The cause of truth wants nothing in its service but the fruits of the Spirit, which are love, joy, peace, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and temperance. All the divisions and subdivisions which now exist among christians, or ever have existed, were caused wholly by the want of those graces. Should we be tenacious about certain sentiments, and peculiarities of faith, the time is not far distant, when universalists, who have suffered every kind of contemptuous treatment, from the enemies of the doctrine, will be at war among themselves, and be trodden under foot of the gentiles. Having begun in the Spirit do not think to be made perfect by the flesh. In order to imitate our Saviour, let us, like him, have compassion on the ignorant and those whom we view to be out of the way. Attend to the exhortation, "Let brotherly love continue." If we agree in brotherly love, there is no disagreement that can do us any injury; but if we do not, no other agreement can do us any good. Let us keep a strict guard against the enemy "that sows discord among brethren." Let us endeavor to "keep the unity of the Spirit

in the bonds of peace." May charity, that heaven born companion of the human heart, never forsake us; and may the promise of the Saviour be fulfilled concerning us, "Lo I am with you even into the end of the world."

You have now, kind reader, cast your eye over these pages; perhaps you feel to say, "the doctrine of universal holiness and happiness cannot be true, notwithstanding all the author has said in favor of it;" and if so, I condemn you not. The time has been, when I believed as little of the doctrine as you now do; I never adopted the belief of universal holiness and happiness out of *choice*, but from the *force* of *real* or *supposed evidence*. And I know you cannot believe it, on any other ground. I hope, however, you feel no enmity to so glorious a system of God's grace; I hope you have the spirit of Christ, and wish well to mankind. I have, besure, great consolation in believing that my Redeemer has many faithful servants and loving disciples in the world, who do not believe in the extensiveness of salvation as I do, and I often take great satisfaction in feasts of charity, with such brethren. St. Peter was undoubtedly a lover of Christ and his gospel, before he was taught by the sea of Joppa to call no man common or unclean. The rest of the disciples, who were dissatisfied with his preaching the gospel to the uncircumcised, were doubtless possessed of the spirit of Christ, which caused them to glorify God when they had more extensive views of the gospel, through Peter's communications. As far as I see men walk in the spirit of love to God and one another, I feel an union with them, whether their particular sentiments are mine, or not. Men cannot believe at will; we believe as evidence ap-

pears to our mind. The times have been, when each denomination has been proscribed, and, in some measure, persecuted. Each as it rose has been censured by those who could not fall in with their doctrine; and what does all this condemning one another prove, only the imperfections of all, and the badness of the human heart? You will not think evil of me, kind reader, if I exhort you not to feel too hard against what you may find to be your duty to acknowledge. It grieved Peter, when his Lord asked him the third time, if he loved him, as he had denied him thrice. There are many universalists now who have frequent occasion to confess how hard they have been against the doctrine, and how much they have spoken unadvisedly with their lips against what they now rejoice to believe is truth, and humbly adore the Saviour of sinners for opening their eyes to behold such unspeakable beauties. If you attend to the exhortation, to grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, undoubtedly you may see more of the riches of his goodness than you now do. The prophet Ezekiel's knowledge of the holy waters was progressive, and obtained by degrees: When he was first led into the waters, they were only to his ancles; but he went still further, and they were to his knees; he went still further, and they were to his loins; he went further, and the waters were *risen*, waters for men to swim in, a *river* that no man could pass. Had the prophet refused to travel in these waters, after he first entered them, he would not have known nor believed them to be so multitudinous as they were. A soul, in the earliest moments of heavenly love, is first unspeakably charmed with the untold beauties and graces of his Re-

deemer; next, wife, children, father, mother, brothers, sisters, all friends, directly enemies, and finally all mankind are embraced in the extended arms of heavenly love and divine benevolence.

I close this work, humbly hoping and expecting the glorious increase and extensive growth of what I have (though feebly) contended for, viz. the holiness and happiness of mankind. I look, with strong expectation, for that period, when all sin, and every degree of unreconciliation will be destroyed, by the divine power of that love which is stronger than death, which many waters cannot quench, nor the floods drown; in which alone I put my trust, and in which my hope is anchored for all mankind; earnestly praying, that the desire of the righteous may not be cut off.

The fulness of times will come, and the times of the restitution of all things will be accomplished. Then shall truth be victorious, and all error flee to eternal night. Then shall universal songs of honor be sung to the praise of him who liveth forever and ever. All death, sorrow and crying, shall be done away; pains and disorders shall be no more felt, temptations no more trouble the lovers of God, nor sin poison the human heart. The blessed hand of the once crucificed shall wipe tears from off all faces. O, transporting thought! Then shall the blessed Saviour see of the travail of his soul, and be satisfied, when, through his mediation, universal nature shall be brought in perfect union with truth and holiness, and the spirit of God fill all rational beings. Then shall the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, which maketh free from the law of sin, become the governing principle of the whole man once made subject to vanity, once inthraled in darkness, sin and misery,

but then, delivered from the bondage of corruption, and restored to perfect reconciliation to God in the heavenly Adam. Then shall the great object of the Saviour's mission be accomplished. Then shall the question be asked, O death, where is thy sting? But death shall not be, to give the answer. And, O grave, where is thy victory? But the boaster shall be silent. The Son shall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father; the eternal radiance shall *smile*, and GOD *shall be* ALL *in* ALL.

Acme
Bookbinding Co., Inc.
100 Cambridge St.
Charlestown, MA 02129

NOT TO BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

3 2044 054 765 003